arXiv:0908.3306v1 [math.RT] 23 Aug 2009

Presenting cyclotomic q-Schur algebras

Kentaro Wada[*]

Abstract. We give a presentation of cyclotomic q-Schur algebras by generators and defining relations. As an application, we give an algorithm for computing decomposition numbers of cyclotomic q-Schur algebras.

§ 0. Introduction

Let $\mathscr{H}_{n,r}$ be an Ariki-Koike algebra associated to a complex reflection group $\mathfrak{S}_n \ltimes (\mathbb{Z}/r\mathbb{Z})^n$. A cyclotomic q-Schur algebra $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ associated to $\mathscr{H}_{n,r}$, introduced in [DJM], is defined as an endomorphism algebra of a certain $\mathscr{H}_{n,r}$-module. In this paper, we give a presentation of cyclotomic q-Schur algebras by generators and defining relations.

In the case where $r = 1$, $\mathscr{H}_{n,1}$ is the Iwahori-Hecke algebra of the symmetric group $\mathfrak{S}_n$, and $\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ is the q-Schur algbera of type A. In this case, $\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ is realized as a quotient algebra of the quantum group $U_q = U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m)$ via the Schur-Weyl duality between $\mathscr{H}_{n,1}$ and U_q in [J]. We remark that the Schur-Weyl duality holds not only over $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ but also over $\mathbb{Z}[q, q^{-1}]$ (see [Du]). By using the surjection from U_q to $\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$, Doty and Giaquinto gave a presentation of $\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ by generators and defining relations in [DG]. They also gave a presentation of $\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ in the way compatible with Lusztig's modified form of U_q. After that, Doty realized in [Do] the generalized q-Schur algebra (in the sense of Donkin) as a quotient algebra of a quantum group (also Lusztig's modified form) associated to any Cartan matrix of finite type.

In the case where $r > 1$, a Schur-Weyl duality between $\mathscr{H}_{n,r}$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ over $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{Q}(q, \gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_r)$ was obtained by Sakamoto and Shoji in [SakS], where $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}_{m_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathfrak{gl}_{m_r}$ is a Levi subalgebra of a parabolic subalgebra of $\mathfrak{gl}_m$. However, this Schur-Weyl duality does not hold over $\mathbb{Z}[q, q^{-1}, \gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_r]$. In fact, Sakamoto-Shoji's Schur-Weyl duality should be understood as a Schur-Weyl duality between modified Aliki-Koike algebra $\mathscr{H}^0_{n,r}$ introduced in [S1], and $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ rather than the duality between $\mathscr{H}_{n,r}$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$. The image of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ in the Schur-Weyl duality is isomorphic to the modified cyclotomic q-Schur algebra $\overline{\mathscr{S}}^0_{n,r}$ associated to $\mathscr{H}^0_{n,r}$ introduced in [SawS]. $\mathscr{H}^0_{n,r}$ and $\overline{\mathscr{S}}^0_{n,r}$ are defined over any integral domain R with parameters satisfying certain conditions. In particular, we have $\mathscr{H}_{n,r} \cong \mathscr{H}^0_{n,r}$ over $\mathcal{K}$ though $\overline{\mathscr{S}}^0_{n,r} \ncong \mathscr{S}_{n,r}$. (Note that $\mathscr{H}_{n,r} \ncong \mathscr{H}^0_{n,r}$ over R in general.) Some relations between $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ and $\overline{\mathscr{S}}^0_{n,r}$ were studied in [SawS] and [Saw]. They showed that $\overline{\mathscr{S}}^0_{n,r}$ turns out to be a subquotient algebra of $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$, and $\overline{\mathscr{S}}^0_{n,r} \cong \bigoplus_{\substack{(n_1,\cdots,n_r) \\ n_1+\cdots+n_r=n}} \mathscr{S}_{n_1,1} \otimes$

---

[*] This research was supported by JSPS Research Fellowships for Young Scientists

$\cdots \otimes \mathscr{S}_{n_r,1}$, where each component $\mathscr{S}_{n_k,1}$ is a q-Schur algebra of type A which is a quotient algebra of the corresponding Levi component $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{m_k})$ of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m)$.

In [SW], we have generalized the results in [SawS] and [Saw] as follows. Let $\mathbf{p} = (r_1, \cdots, r_g) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^g$ be such that $r_1 + \cdots + r_g = r$. We define a subquotient algebra $\overline{\mathscr{S}}^{\mathbf{p}}_{n,r}$ of $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ with respect to $\mathbf{p}$ by using a cellular basis of $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ given in [DJM]. Then we have $\overline{\mathscr{S}}^{\mathbf{p}}_{n,r} \cong \bigoplus_{\substack{(n_1,\cdots,n_g) \\ n_1+\cdots+n_g=n}} \mathscr{S}_{n_1,r_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathscr{S}_{n_g,r_g}$. The case of $\mathbf{p} = (1, \cdots, 1)$ is the one discussed in [SawS], and $\overline{\mathscr{S}}^{(r)}_{n,r}$ (the case of $\mathbf{p} = (r)$) is just $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$. These structures suggest us that $\overline{\mathscr{S}}^{\mathbf{p}}_{n,r}$ is a quotient algebra of a certain algebra $\widetilde{U}_q(\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbf{p}})$ with respect to the Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbf{p}} = \mathfrak{gl}_{m_1+\cdots+m_{r_1}} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathfrak{gl}_{m_{r_1+\cdots+r_{g-1}+1}+\cdots+m_r}$ of $\mathfrak{gl}_m$. In particular, $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ should be a quotient algebra of a certain algebra $\widetilde{U}_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m)$. (Note that $\widetilde{U}_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m)$ (also $\widetilde{U}_q(\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbf{p}})$) is not a quantum group.) This is a motivation in this paper.

On the other hand, in [DR2], Du and Rui defined (upper and lower) Borel subalgebras $\mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r}$ and $\mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}$ of $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$, and they showed that $\mathscr{S}_{n,r} = \mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r} \cdot \mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r}$. Moreover, they showed that the Borel subalgebra $\mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r}$ (resp. $\mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}$) is isomorphic to the Borel subalgebra $\mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{m,1}$ (resp. $\mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{m,1}$) of a q-Schur algebra $\mathscr{S}_{m,1}$ of type A with an appropriate rank. In fact, the Borel subalgebra $\mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{m,1}$ (resp. $\mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{m,1}$) of $\mathscr{S}_{m,1}$ is a quotient algebra of an upper (resp. lower) Borel subalgebra of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m)$. These structures imply that $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ is presented by generators of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m)$ with certain defining relations which are different from the defining relations of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m)$. This is a main idea to find presentations of $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ by generators and relations.

This paper is organized as follows. In §1, we introduce a certain algebra $\widetilde{U}_q = \widetilde{U}_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m)$ associated to the Cartan data of $\mathfrak{gl}_m$. A quantum group $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m)$ turns out to be a quotient algebra of $\widetilde{U}_q$. We also prepare several notions for representations of $\widetilde{U}_q$ similar to the case of quantum groups, e.g. weight modules, highest weight modules and Verma modules. In §2, we define a (various) finite dimensional quotient algebra $\mathcal{S}_q$ of $\widetilde{U}_q$. This construction of $\mathcal{S}_q$ was inspired by the construction of generalized q-Schur algebra in [Do]. In fact, both of a q-Schur algebra $\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ of type A and a cyclotomic q-Schr algbera $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ are examples of these finite dimentional quotient algebras of $\widetilde{U}_q$. We also give a method to study representations of $\mathcal{S}_q$ analogous to the theory of cellular algebras in [GL]. In some cases, $\mathcal{S}_q$ turns out to be a quasi-hereditary cellular algebra. In §3, we develop an argument of specialization of $\mathcal{S}_q$ to an arbitrary ring and parameters by taking divided powers. We remark that the arguments in §1-§3 can be applied to any Cartan matrix of finite type. (See Remarks 3.16 (ii).)

After reviews for known results on q-Schur algebras and cyclotomic q-Schur algebras in §4 and §5, we define a surjective homomorphism $\widetilde{\rho}$ from $\widetilde{U}_q$ to $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ in §6. By using the surjection $\widetilde{\rho}$ combined with the results in §1-§3, we give two presentations of $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ in §7 (Theorem 7.16).

Finally, we give an algorithm to compute the decomposition numbers of cyclotomic q-Schur algebras in §8.

Acknowledgments : The part of this work was done during the author's stay in the University of Sydney. He is grateful to Professors G. Lehrer and A. Mathas for their hospitality. In particular, the author thanks A. Mathas for many helpful advices and discussions for this work. He is also grateful to Professor T. Shoji for several advices, in particular for having taught the content of Proposition 4.7. Thanks are also due to Professors S. Ariki and H. Miyachi for many advices and encouragements.

CONTENTS

§ 0. Introduction 1
§ 1. Algebra $\widetilde{U}_q$ 3
§ 2. Algebra $\mathcal{S}_q$ 9
§ 3. Specialization to an arbitrary ring 21
§ 4. Review on q-Schur algebras of type A 27
§ 5. Review on Cyclotomic q-Schur algebras 31
§ 6. A cyclotomic q-Schur algebra as a quotient algebra of $\widetilde{U}_q$ 33
§ 7. Presentations of cyclotomic q-Schur algebras 40
§ 8. An algorithm for computing decomposition numbers 48
Appendix A. A proof of Proposition 4.7. 50
Appendix B. Example : Cyclotomic q-Schur algebra of type $G(2,1,2)$ 52
Appendix C. Example : The case of $\eta_i^\lambda = 0$ 57
References 57

§ 1. ALGEBRA $\widetilde{U}_q$

1.1. Let $P = \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \mathbb{Z}\varepsilon_i$ be a weight lattice of $\mathfrak{gl}_m$, and $P^\vee = \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \mathbb{Z}h_i$ be the dual weight lattice with the natural pairing $\langle\,,\,\rangle : P \times P^\vee \to \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\langle \varepsilon_i, h_j\rangle = \delta_{ij}$. Set $\alpha_i = \varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_{i+1}$ for $i = 1, \cdots, m-1$, then $\Pi = \{\alpha_i \,|\, 1 \le i \le m-1\}$ is a set of simple roots, and $Q = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m-1} \mathbb{Z}\,\alpha_i$ is a root lattice of $\mathfrak{gl}_m$. Put $Q^+ = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m-1} \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}\,\alpha_i$. We define a partial order "$\ge$" on P by $\lambda \ge \mu$ if $\lambda - \mu \in Q^+$.

1.2. A quantum group $U_q = U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m)$ is the associative algebra over $\mathbb{Q}(q)$, where q is an indeterminate, with 1 generated by e_i, f_i $(1 \le i \le m-1)$ and $K_i^{\pm}$ $(1 \le i \le m)$ with the following defining relations (we denote K_i^+ by K_i simply) :

$$K_iK_j = K_jK_i, \quad K_iK_i^- = K_i^-K_i = 1 \tag{1.2.1}$$

$$K_ie_jK_i^- = q^{\langle \alpha_j, h_i\rangle} e_j \tag{1.2.2}$$

$$K_if_jK_i^- = q^{-\langle \alpha_j, h_i\rangle} f_j \tag{1.2.3}$$

$$e_if_j - f_je_i = \delta_{ij}\frac{K_iK_{i+1}^- - K_i^-K_{i+1}}{q-q^{-1}} \tag{1.2.4}$$

$$e_{i\pm1}e_i^2 - (q+q^{-1})e_ie_{i\pm1}e_i + e_i^2e_{i\pm1} = 0 \tag{1.2.5}$$

$$e_ie_j = e_je_i \qquad (|i-j| \ge 2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &f_{i\pm1}f_i^2-(q+q^{-1})f_if_{i\pm1}f_i+f_i^2f_{i\pm1}=0 \\ &f_if_j=f_jf_i \qquad (|i-j|\geq 2) \end{aligned} \tag{1.2.6}$$

Let U_q^+ (resp. U_q^-) be the subalgebra of U_q generated by e_i (resp. f_i) for $i=1,\cdots,m-1$, and U_q^0 be the subalgebra of U_q generated by $K_i^\pm$ for $i=1,\cdots,m$. It is well known that U_q has the triangular decomposition

$$U_q\cong U_q^-\otimes U_q^0\otimes U_q^+ \text{ as vector spaces.}$$

Let $\mathcal{B}^+$ (resp. $\mathcal{B}^-$) be the subalgebra of U_q generated by e_i (resp. f_i) for $1\leq i\leq m-1$ and $K_i^\pm$ for $1\leq i\leq m$. We call $\mathcal{B}^\pm$ a Borel subalgebra of U_q. The following lemma is well known.

Lemma 1.3.

(i) *U_q^+ (resp. U_q^-) is isomorphic to the algebra defined by generators e_i (resp. f_i) $(1\leq i\leq m-1)$ with a defining relation (1.2.5) (resp. (1.2.6)).*
(ii) *U_q^0 is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Q}(q)[K_1^\pm,\cdots,K_m^\pm]$.*
(iii) *$\mathcal{B}^+$ is isomorphic to the algebra defined by generators e_i $(1\leq i\leq m-1)$ and $K_i^\pm$ $(1\leq i\leq m)$ with defining relations (1.2.1), (1.2.2) and (1.2.5)*
(iv) *$\mathcal{B}^-$ is isomorphic to the algebra defined by generators f_i $(1\leq i\leq m-1)$ and $K_i^\pm$ $(1\leq i\leq m)$ with defining relation (1.2.1), (1.2.3) and (1.2.6).*

1.4. Put $\mathcal{Z}=\mathbb{Z}[q,q^{-1}]$. We define the $\mathcal{Z}$-form of U_q as follows. For any integer $k\in\mathbb{Z}$, put

$$[k]=\frac{q^k-q^{-k}}{q-q^{-1}}.$$

For any positive integer $t\in\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, put $[t]!=[t][t-1]\cdots[1]$ and set $[0]!=1$. For any integer k and any positive integer t, put

$$\begin{bmatrix} k \\ t \end{bmatrix}=\frac{[k][k-1]\cdots[k-t+1]}{[t][t-1]\cdots[1]}=\frac{[k]!}{[t]![k-t]!}.$$

For $k\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq0}$ and $i=1,\cdots,m-1$, put

$$e_i^{(k)}=\frac{e_i^k}{[k]!},\quad f_i^{(k)}=\frac{f_i^k}{[k]!}.$$

For $t\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq0}$, $c\in\mathbb{Z}$ and $i=1,\cdots,m$, put

$$\begin{bmatrix} K_i;c \\ t \end{bmatrix}=\prod_{s=1}^{t}\frac{K_iq^{c-s+1}-K_i^{-1}q^{-c+s-1}}{q^s-q^{-s}}.$$

Let ${}_{\mathcal{Z}}U_q$ be the $\mathcal{Z}$-subalgebra of U_q generated by all $e_i^{(k)}, f_i^{(k)}, K_i^{\pm}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} K_i; 0 \\ t \end{bmatrix}$. We also define the $\mathcal{Z}$-subalgebra ${}_{\mathcal{Z}}\mathcal{B}^+$ (resp. ${}_{\mathcal{Z}}\mathcal{B}^-$) of U_q generated by all $e_i^{(k)}$ (resp. $f_i^{(k)}$), $K_i^{\pm}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} K_i; 0 \\ t \end{bmatrix}$.

1.5. Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{Z}[\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_r]$ be the polynomial ring over $\mathcal{Z}$ with indeterminate elements $\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_r$, where r is an arbitrary non-negative integer (put $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{Z}$ when $r = 0$), and let $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{Q}(q, \gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_r)$ be the quotient field of $\mathcal{A}$. We define the associative algebra $\widetilde{U}_q = \widetilde{U}_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m)$ over $\mathcal{K}$ with the unit element 1 by the following generators and defining relations:

generators: e_i, f_i $(1 \leq i \leq m-1)$, $K_i^{\pm}$ $(1 \leq i \leq m)$, τ_i $(1 \leq i \leq m-1)$.

defining relations:

$$K_iK_j = K_jK_i, \quad K_iK_i^- = K_i^-K_i = 1, \tag{1.5.1}$$

$$K_ie_jK_i^- = q^{\langle \alpha_j, h_i \rangle} e_j, \tag{1.5.2}$$

$$K_if_jK_i^- = q^{-\langle \alpha_j, h_i \rangle} f_j, \tag{1.5.3}$$

$$K_i\tau_jK_i^- = \tau_j, \tag{1.5.4}$$

$$e_if_j - f_je_i = \delta_{ij}\tau_i \tag{1.5.5}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &e_{i\pm1}e_i^2 - (q+q^{-1})e_ie_{i\pm1}e_i + e_i^2e_{i\pm1} = 0, \\ &e_ie_j = e_je_i \qquad (|i-j| \geq 2), \end{aligned} \tag{1.5.6}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &f_{i\pm1}f_i^2 - (q+q^{-1})f_if_{i\pm1}f_i + f_i^2f_{i\pm1} = 0, \\ &f_if_j = f_jf_i \qquad (|i-j| \geq 2). \end{aligned} \tag{1.5.7}$$

Set $\deg e_i = \alpha_i$, $\deg f_i = -\alpha_i$, $\deg K_i^{\pm} = 0$ and $\deg \tau_i = 0$. Since all the defining relations of $\widetilde{U}_q$ are homogeneous under this degree, $\widetilde{U}_q$ is a Q-graded algebra, and $\widetilde{U}_q$ has the following root space decomposition

$$\widetilde{U}_q = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in Q} \big(\widetilde{U}_q\big)_\alpha ,$$

where $\big(\widetilde{U}_q\big)_\alpha = \big\{ u \in \widetilde{U}_q \bigm| K_iuK_i^- = q^{\langle \alpha, h_i \rangle} u \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq m \big\}$. For $u \in \widetilde{U}_q$, we denote by $\deg(u) = \alpha$ if $u \in (\widetilde{U}_q)_\alpha$.

The following proposition is clear from definitions.

Proposition 1.6. *Let $\widetilde{I}$ be the two-sided ideal of $\widetilde{U}_q$ generated by*

$$\tau_i - \frac{K_iK_{i+1}^- - K_i^-K_{i+1}}{q-q^{-1}} \quad \textit{for} \;\; i = 1, \cdots, m-1.$$

Then we have the following isomorphism of algebras.

$$\widetilde{U}_q/\widetilde{I} \cong \mathcal{K} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}(q)} U_q.$$

Remark 1.7. We note that the parameters $\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_r$ do not appear in the definition of $\widetilde{U}_q$. However, we will use these parameters later when we consider some representations of $\widetilde{U}_q$ or some quotient algebras of $\widetilde{U}_q$.

1.8. Let $\widetilde{U}_q^+$ (resp. $\widetilde{U}_q^-$) be the subalgebra of $\widetilde{U}_q$ generated by e_i (resp. f_i) for $i = 1, \cdots, m-1$, and let $\widetilde{U}_q^0$ be the subalgebra of $\widetilde{U}_q$ generated by $K_i^{\pm}$ for $i = 1, \cdots, m$. We also define a Borel subalgebra of $\widetilde{U}_q$ as follows. Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^+$ (resp. $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^-$) be the subalgebra of $\widetilde{U}_q$ generated by $\widetilde{U}_q^+$ (resp. $\widetilde{U}_q^-$) and $\widetilde{U}_q^0$. Lemma 1.3 and Proposition 1.6 imply the following corollary.

Corollary 1.9. *There exist the following isomorphisms of algebras.*

$$\widetilde{U}_q^{\pm} \cong \mathcal{K} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}(q)} U_q^{\pm}, \quad \widetilde{U}_q^0 \cong \mathcal{K} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}(q)} U_q^0, \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\pm} \cong \mathcal{K} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}(q)} \mathcal{B}^{\pm}.$$

Proof. We only show an isomorphism for Borel subalgebras. Other isomorphisms can be shown in a similar way. By Lemma 1.3, we have a surjective homomorphism of algebras $\mathcal{K} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}(q)} \mathcal{B}^{\pm} \to \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\pm}$. On the other hand, by restricting the surjection $\widetilde{U}_q \to \mathcal{K} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}(q)} U_q$ in Proposition 1.6 to $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\pm}$, we have a surjection $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^{\pm} \to \mathcal{K} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}(q)} \mathcal{B}^{\pm}$. Thus, we have $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^+ \cong \mathcal{K} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}(q)} \mathcal{B}^+$. □

1.10. For $\eta = (\eta_1, \cdots, \eta_{m-1})$ such that $\eta_i \in \widetilde{U}_q^- \widetilde{U}_q^0 \widetilde{U}_q^+$ with $\deg(\eta_i) = 0$, let $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^{\eta}$ be the category consisting of $\widetilde{U}_q$-modules satisfying the following conditions (a) and (b):

(a): $M \in \widehat{\mathcal{O}}^{\eta}$ has the weight space decomposition

$$M = \bigoplus_{\mu \in P} M_{\mu},$$

where $M_{\mu} = \big\{ v \in M \bigm| K_i \cdot v = q^{\langle \mu, h_i \rangle} v \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq m \big\}$.

(b): For $M \in \widehat{\mathcal{O}}^{\eta}$ and $i = 1, \cdots, m-1$, it holds that $(\tau_i - \eta_i) \cdot M = 0$.

Let $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^{\eta}_{\mathrm{tri}}$ be the full subcategory of $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^{\eta}$ satisfying the following additional condition:

(c): For each $u \in \widetilde{U}_q$, there exists an element $x \in \widetilde{U}_q^- \widetilde{U}_q^0 \widetilde{U}_q^+$ such that

$$(u - x) \cdot M = 0 \quad \text{ for any } M \in \widehat{\mathcal{O}}^{\eta}_{\mathrm{tri}}.$$

By this definitions, in $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^{\eta}_{\mathrm{tri}}$, the action of $\widetilde{U}_q$ has a triangular decomposition.

Finally, let $\mathcal{O}^{\eta}$ be the full subcategory of $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^{\eta}$ satisfying the following additional conditions:

(d): For any $M \in \mathcal{O}^{\eta}$, the dimension of M is finite.

(e): For any $M \in \mathcal{O}^{\eta}$, we have

$$M_{\mu} = 0 \qquad \text{unless } \mu \in P_{\geq 0},$$

where $P_{\geq 0} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\, \varepsilon_i$.

As is seen later, $\mathcal{O}^\eta$ is a full subcategory of $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\eta_{\text{tri}}$. Moreover, we will construct all simple objects of $\mathcal{O}^\eta$ through some quotient algebras of $\widetilde{U}_q$ (Theorem 2.20).

Remarks 1.11.

(i) If $\eta_i \in \widetilde{U}_q^0$ for any $i = 1, \cdots, m-1$, we have $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\eta = \widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\eta_{\text{tri}}$.

(ii) Let $\widetilde{I}^\eta$ be the two-sided ideal of $\widetilde{U}_q$ generated by $(\tau_i - \eta_i)$, and put $\widetilde{U}_q^\eta = \widetilde{U}_q/\widetilde{I}^\eta$. Then, we can regard a $\widetilde{U}_q^\eta$-module as a $\widetilde{U}_q$-module through the natural surjection. Clearly, any $\widetilde{U}_q^\eta$-module equipped with the weight space decomposition is contained in $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\eta$. On the other hand, a $\widetilde{U}_q$-module M contained in $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\eta$ is regarded as a $\widetilde{U}_q^\eta$-module since we have that $\widetilde{I}^\eta \cdot M = 0$ by the condition (b). Thus, the category $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\eta$ coincides with the category consisting of $\widetilde{U}_q^\eta$-modules which have weight space decompositions.

(iii) When $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{Q}(q)$ and $\eta_i = (K_i K_{i+1}^- - K_i^- K_{i+1})/(q - q^{-1})$ for any $i = 1, \cdots, m-1$, $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\eta$ coincides with the category of U_q-modules having weight space decompositions.

1.12. Next, we introduce a notion of highest weight modules. Let η be as in 1.10. We call $\widetilde{U}_q$-module M_λ^η a highest weight module of highest weight $\lambda \in P$ associated to η if there exists an element $v_\lambda \in M_\lambda^\eta$ satisfying the following conditions:

$$u \cdot v_\lambda = 0 \qquad \text{for any } u \in \widetilde{U}_q \text{ such that } \deg(u) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} d_i \alpha_i \text{ with } d_i > 0 \text{ for some } i, \tag{1.12.1}$$

$$K_i \cdot v_\lambda = q^{\langle \lambda, h_i \rangle} v_\lambda \qquad \text{for } i = 1, \cdots, m, \tag{1.12.2}$$

$$\widetilde{U}_q \cdot v_\lambda = M_\lambda^\eta, \tag{1.12.3}$$

$$(\tau_i - \eta_i) \cdot M_\lambda^\eta = 0 \qquad \text{for } i = 1, \cdots, m-1, \tag{1.12.4}$$

We call the above element v_λ a highest weight vector of M_λ^η.

Remarks 1.13.

(i) Note that, since we take $\eta_i \in \widetilde{U}_q^- \widetilde{U}_q^0 \widetilde{U}_q^+$ such that $\deg(\eta_i) = 0$, (1.12.1), (1.12.2) and (1.12.4) imply that $\tau_i \cdot v_\lambda \in \mathcal{K} \cdot v_\lambda$.

(ii) A highest weight module M_λ^η is contained in $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\eta$.

(iii) If a highest weight module M_λ^η is contained in $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\eta_{\text{tri}}$, we can replace (1.12.1) with

$$e_i \cdot v_\lambda = 0 \qquad \text{for } i = 1, \cdots, m-1. \tag{1.13.1}$$

(iv) For a $\widetilde{U}_q^\eta$-module M, if there exists an element $v_\lambda \in M$ for some $\lambda \in P$ satisfying the conditions (1.12.1)-(1.12.3), M is a highest weight module of highest weight $\lambda \in P$ associated to η. In particular, if $\eta_i = (K_i K_{i+1}^- - K_i^- K_{i+1})/(q - q^{-1})$ for any $i = 1, \cdots, m-1$ (namely, $\widetilde{U}_q^\eta \cong U_q$), the definition of a highest weight module in 1.12 coincides with the usual definition of a highest weight module of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m)$.

Lemma 1.14. *If a highest weight module M_λ^η is contained in $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{tri}^\eta$, we have the followings.*

(i) *The dimension of the weight space $(M_\lambda^\eta)_\lambda$ with the highest weight λ is equal to* 1.

(ii) *M_λ^η has the unique maximal submodule.*

Proof. (i) is clear from definitions. By (i) and (1.12.3), a proper $\widetilde{U}_q$-submodule of M_λ^η does not have a weight λ. Thus, the sum of all proper $\widetilde{U}_q$-submodules of M_λ^η does not have the weight λ, and this is the unique maximal submodule of M_λ^η. □

Remark 1.15. When a highest weight module M_λ^η with a highest weight vector v_λ is **not** contained in $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{tri}}^\eta$, it may occur that $u \cdot v_\lambda \notin \mathcal{K} v_\lambda$ and $u \cdot v_\lambda$ has the weight λ for some $u \in \widetilde{U}_q$ such that $\deg(u) = 0$.

1.16. Let J_λ^η be the left ideal of $\widetilde{U}_q$ generated by

$$\begin{aligned} & u \in \widetilde{U}_q && \text{such that } \deg(u) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} d_i \alpha_i \text{ with } d_i > 0 \text{ for some } i, \\ & K_i - q^{\langle \lambda, h_i \rangle} 1 && \text{for } i = 1, \cdots, m, \\ & (\tau_i - \eta_i) \cdot u && \text{for } i = 1, \cdots, m-1 \text{ and } u \in \widetilde{U}_q, \end{aligned}$$

Put $V_\lambda^\eta = \widetilde{U}_q / J_\lambda^\eta$, then one sees that V_λ^η is a highest weight module of a highest weight λ associated to η with a highest weight vector $1 + J_\lambda^\eta$. We call V_λ^η a Verma module of $\widetilde{U}_q$. We have the following lemma.

Lemma 1.17. *Any highest weight module M_λ^η of a highest weight λ associated to η is a homomorphic image of V_λ^η.*

Proof. Let M_λ^η be a highest weight module of a highest weight λ associated to η with a highest weight vector v_λ. We regard $\widetilde{U}_q$ as a $\widetilde{U}_q$-module by left multiplications. Then, we have a natural surjective homomorphism of $\widetilde{U}_q$-modules $\widetilde{U}_q \to M_\lambda^\eta$ such that $1 \mapsto v_\lambda$. Moreover, one can check that J_λ^η is included in the kernel of this homomorphism. Thus, this homomorphism induces the surjective homomorphism from V_λ^η to M_λ^η. □

1.18. Finally, we consider an $\mathcal{A}$-form of $\widetilde{U}_q$ as follows. We use the same notations in 1.4. Let ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\widetilde{U}_q$ be the $\mathcal{A}$-subalgebra of $\widetilde{U}_q$ generated by all $e_i^{(k)}, f_i^{(k)}, K_i^\pm, \tau_i$ and $\begin{bmatrix} K_i; 0 \\ t \end{bmatrix}$. We also define the $\mathcal{A}$-subalgebra ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^+$ (resp. ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^-$) of $\widetilde{U}_q$ generated by all $e_i^{(k)}$ (resp. $f_i^{(k)}$), $K_i^\pm$ and $\begin{bmatrix} K_i; 0 \\ t \end{bmatrix}$. Then, an isomorphism ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^\pm \cong \mathcal{A} \otimes_{\mathcal{Z}} {}_{\mathcal{Z}}\mathcal{B}^\pm$ follows from Corollary 1.9.

§ 2. Algebra $\mathcal{S}_q$

Recall that $P = \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \mathbb{Z}\varepsilon_i$ is the weight lattice of $\mathfrak{gl}_m$. We can identify P with a set of m-tuple of integers $\mathbb{Z}^m$ by the correspondence

$$P \ni \lambda = \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \varepsilon_i \mapsto (\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m.$$

Under this identification, we use the notation $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_m)$ for $\lambda \in P$. Let $\varLambda$ be a finite subset of $P_{\geq 0} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\, \varepsilon_i$. In this section, we consider a certain quotient algebra $S_q = S_q(\varLambda)$ of $\widetilde{U}_q$ with respect to $\varLambda$.

2.1. We define the associative algebra $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q = \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q(\varLambda)$ over $\mathcal{K}$ with 1 by following generators and defining relations:

generators: E_i, F_i $(1 \leq i \leq m-1)$, 1_λ $(\lambda \in \varLambda)$, τ_i^λ $(1 \leq i \leq m-1,\ \lambda \in \varLambda)$.
defining relations:

$$1_\lambda 1_\mu = \delta_{\lambda\mu} 1_\lambda, \quad \sum_{\lambda \in \varLambda} 1_\lambda = 1, \tag{2.1.1}$$

$$\tau_i^\lambda 1_\mu = 1_\mu \tau_i^\lambda = \delta_{\lambda\mu}\tau_i^\lambda, \tag{2.1.2}$$

$$E_i 1_\lambda = \begin{cases} 1_{\lambda+\alpha_i} E_i & \text{if } \lambda + \alpha_i \in \varLambda \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \tag{2.1.3}$$

$$F_i 1_\lambda = \begin{cases} 1_{\lambda-\alpha_i} F_i & \text{if } \lambda - \alpha_i \in \varLambda \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \tag{2.1.4}$$

$$1_\lambda E_i = \begin{cases} E_i 1_{\lambda-\alpha_i} & \text{if } \lambda - \alpha_i \in \varLambda \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \tag{2.1.5}$$

$$1_\lambda F_i = \begin{cases} F_i 1_{\lambda+\alpha_i} & \text{if } \lambda + \alpha_i \in \varLambda \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \tag{2.1.6}$$

$$E_i F_j - F_j E_i = \delta_{ij}\Big(\sum_{\lambda \in \varLambda} \tau_i^\lambda\Big), \tag{2.1.7}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &E_{i\pm1}E_i^2 - (q+q^{-1})E_iE_{i\pm1}E_i + E_i^2E_{i\pm1} = 0,\\ &E_iE_j = E_jE_i \qquad (|i-j| \geq 2), \end{aligned} \tag{2.1.8}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &F_{i\pm1}F_i^2 - (q+q^{-1})F_iF_{i\pm1}F_i + F_i^2F_{i\pm1} = 0,\\ &F_iF_j = F_jF_i \qquad (|i-j| \geq 2). \end{aligned} \tag{2.1.9}$$

We can prove the following proposition in a similar way as in [Do, Proposition 3.4].

Proposition 2.2. *There exists a surjective homomorphism of algebras*

$$\widetilde{\Psi} : \widetilde{U}_q \to \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q$$

such that $\widetilde{\Psi}(e_i) = E_i$, $\widetilde{\Psi}(f_i) = F_i$, $\widetilde{\Psi}(K_i^{\pm}) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} q^{\pm \lambda_i} 1_\lambda$, $\widetilde{\Psi}(\tau_i) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \tau_i^\lambda$.

Proof. In order to show that $\widetilde{\Psi}$ is well-defined, we should check the defining relations of $\widetilde{U}_q$ in the images of $\widetilde{\Psi}$, and we see them in direct calculations. Note that $\tau_i^\lambda = \big(\sum_{\mu \in \Lambda} \tau_i^\mu\big) 1_\lambda = \widetilde{\Psi}(\tau_i) 1_\lambda$ by (2.1.2). Thus, in order to prove that $\widetilde{\Psi}$ is surjective, it is enough to show that 1_λ ($\lambda \in \Lambda$) is generated by the image of K_i ($i = 1, \cdots, m$). This will be proven in Lemma 2.3. □

We define a partial order " $\succeq$ " on $P_{\geq 0}$ by $\lambda \succ \mu$ if $\lambda \neq \mu$ and $\lambda_i \geq \mu_i$ for any $i = 1, \cdots, m$. For $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_m) \in \Lambda$, put

$$K_\lambda = \begin{bmatrix} K_1; 0 \\ \lambda_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} K_2; 0 \\ \lambda_2 \end{bmatrix} \cdots \begin{bmatrix} K_m; 0 \\ \lambda_m \end{bmatrix}. \tag{2.2.1}$$

Then we have the following lemma.

Lemma 2.3.

(i) $\widetilde{\Psi}\left(\begin{bmatrix} K_i; 0 \\ t \end{bmatrix}\right)$ $(1 \leq i \leq m,\ t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})$ *is written as a linear combination of* $\{1_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ *with* $\mathcal{Z}$*-coefficients.*

(ii) *For* $\lambda \in \Lambda$*, we have*

$$1_\lambda = \widetilde{\Psi}(K_\lambda) + \sum_{\substack{\mu \in \Lambda \\ \mu \succ \lambda}} r_\mu \widetilde{\Psi}(K_\mu) \qquad (r_\mu \in \mathcal{Z}).$$

Proof. In this proof, we denote $\widetilde{\Psi}(K_i^{\pm})$ by $K_i^{\pm}$ simply. Thus, we have $K_i^{\pm} = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} q^{\pm \lambda_i} 1_\lambda$. For $1 \leq i \leq m, t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} K_i; 0 \\ t \end{bmatrix} 1_\lambda &= \prod_{s=1}^{t} \frac{K_i q^{-s+1} - K_i^- q^{s-1}}{q^s - q^{-s}} 1_\lambda \\ &= \prod_{s=1}^{t} \frac{q^{\lambda_i - s + 1} - q^{-(\lambda_i - s + 1)}}{q^s - q^{-s}} 1_\lambda \\ &= \prod_{s=1}^{t} \frac{[\lambda_i - s + 1]}{[s]} 1_\lambda \\ &= \frac{[\lambda_i][\lambda_i - 1] \cdots [\lambda_i - t + 1]}{[1][2] \cdots [t]} 1_\lambda \\ &= \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i \\ t \end{bmatrix} 1_\lambda & \text{if } t \leq \lambda_i \\ 0 & \text{if } t > \lambda_i. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{2.3.1}$$

Since $1 = \sum_{\lambda \in \varLambda} 1_\lambda$ and $\begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i \\ t \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{Z}$, we have (i). By the definition of K_λ and (2.3.1), we have

$$K_\lambda = K_\lambda(\sum_{\mu \in \varLambda} 1_\mu) = 1_\lambda + \sum_{\substack{\mu \in \varLambda \\ \mu \succ \lambda}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{m} \begin{bmatrix} \mu_i \\ \lambda_i \end{bmatrix} 1_\mu \right). \tag{2.3.2}$$

Since $\varLambda$ is a finite set, there exists a maximal element $\lambda \in \varLambda$ with respect to the order "$\succeq$". Thus, we have $1_\lambda = K_\lambda$ when λ is a maximal element of $\varLambda$ by (2.3.2). By induction on $\varLambda$ together with (2.3.2), we have (ii). □

Remark 2.4. For $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_m) \in P_{\geq 0}$, set $|\lambda| = \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i$. If $\varLambda = \{\lambda \in P_{\geq 0} \,|\, |\lambda| = n\}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we have $\mu \not\succ \lambda$ for any $\lambda, \mu \in \varLambda$ since $|\mu| > |\lambda|$ if $\mu \succ \lambda$. Thus, we have $1_\lambda = \widetilde{\Psi}(K_\lambda)$ for any $\lambda \in \varLambda$ by Lemma 2.3.

2.5. Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q^+$ (resp. $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q^-$) be the subalgebra of $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q$ generated by E_i (resp. F_i) for $1 \leq i \leq m-1$, and let $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q^0$ be the subalgebra of $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q$ generated by 1_λ for $\lambda \in \varLambda$. By Lemma 2.3, it is clear that $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q^0$ (resp. $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q^\pm$) coincides with the image of $\widetilde{U}_q^0$ (resp. $\widetilde{U}_q^\pm$) under the surjection $\widetilde{\Psi}$ in Proposition 2.2.

We consider the Q-grading on $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q$ arising from the grading on $\widetilde{U}_q$, namely we set $\deg E_i = \alpha_i$, $\deg F_i = -\alpha_i$, $\deg 1_\lambda = 0$, $\deg \tau_i^\lambda = 0$.

For each $\lambda \in \varLambda$ and $i = 1, \cdots, m-1$, we take an element η_i^λ of $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q^- \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q^+ \cdot 1_\lambda$ such that $\deg(\eta_i^\lambda) = 0$. By the condition $\deg(\eta_i^\lambda) = 0$ together with (2.1.3)-(2.1.6), we have $\eta_i^\lambda \in 1_\lambda \cdot \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q^- \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q^+ \cdot 1_\lambda$. Moreover, again by (2.1.3)-(2.1.6), we have $\eta_i^\lambda \in \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q^- \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q^0 \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q^+$. Put $\eta_\varLambda = \{\eta_i^\lambda \,|\, 1 \leq i \leq m-1,\ \lambda \in \varLambda\}$. Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{I}}^{\eta_\varLambda}$ be the two-sided ideal of $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q$ generated by all $\tau_i^\lambda - \eta_i^\lambda$ ($1 \leq i \leq m-1$, $\lambda \in \varLambda$). We define the quotient algebra $\mathcal{S}_q$ of $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q$ by

$$\mathcal{S}_q = \mathcal{S}_q^{\eta_\varLambda} = \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q / \widetilde{\mathcal{I}}^{\eta_\varLambda}.$$

Let $\mathcal{S}_q^0$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}_q^\pm$), be the image of $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q^0$ (resp. $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q^\pm$) under the natural surjection $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q \to \mathcal{S}_q$. Under the map $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q \to \mathcal{S}_q$, we denote the image of E_i (resp. F_i, 1_λ) by the same symbol E_i (resp. F_i, 1_λ) again, and the image of τ_i^λ by η_i^λ. We denote the composition of $\widetilde{\Psi}$ and the natural surjection $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q \to \mathcal{S}_q$ by $\Psi : \widetilde{U}_q \to \mathcal{S}_q$. Thus, we have $\Psi(e_i) = E_i$, $\Psi(f_i) = F_i$, $\Psi(K_i^\pm) = \sum_{\lambda \in \varLambda} q^{\pm\lambda_i} 1_\lambda$ and $\Psi(\tau_i) = \sum_{\lambda \in \varLambda} \eta_i^\lambda$.

Proposition 2.6. *$\mathcal{S}_q$ has a triangular decomposition*

$$\mathcal{S}_q = \mathcal{S}_q^- \mathcal{S}_q^0 \mathcal{S}_q^+.$$

Moreover, the dimension of $\mathcal{S}_q$ is finite.

Proof. First, we show the following claim.

(Claim A) For $1 \leq i, j_1, \cdots, j_l \leq m-1$, we have

$$E_i F_{j_1} \cdots F_{j_l} = \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} a_k E_k + b,$$

where $a_k \in \mathcal{S}_q$ and $b \in \mathcal{S}_q^- \mathcal{S}_q^0$.

We prove this claim by induction on l. When $l = 1$, we have

$$E_i F_{j_1} = \begin{cases} F_{j_1} E_i + \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \eta_i^\lambda & \text{if } i = j_1 \\ F_{j_1} E_i & \text{otherwise .} \end{cases}$$

Since $\eta_i^\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_q^- \mathcal{S}_q^0 \mathcal{S}_q^+$, we obtain the claim. When $l \geq 2$, we have

$$E_i F_{j_1} \cdots F_{j_l} = \begin{cases} F_{j_1} E_i F_{j_2} \cdots F_{j_l} + \Big(\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \eta_i^\lambda \Big) F_{j_2} \cdots F_{j_l} & \text{if } i = j_1 \\ F_{j_1} E_i F_{j_2} \cdots F_{j_l} & \text{otherwise .} \end{cases}$$

Note that $\eta_i^\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_q^- \mathcal{S}_q^0 \mathcal{S}_q^+$ and $\deg(\eta_i^\lambda) = 0$. Applying the induction hypothesis to the right hand side of this formula, we obtain the claim.

For any $u \in \mathcal{S}_q$, we have $u = u \cdot 1 = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} u \cdot 1_\lambda$. Thus, in order to prove the first assertion of the proposition, we should show that

(**Claim B**) $$u \cdot 1_\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_q^- \mathcal{S}_q^+ \cdot 1_\lambda \quad \text{for any } u \in \mathcal{S}_q \text{ and } \lambda \in \Lambda.$$

This claim implies that $u \in \mathcal{S}_q^- \mathcal{S}_q^0 \mathcal{S}_q^+$ for any $u \in \mathcal{S}_q$ by the relation (2.1.3). Hence, we show (**Claim B**) by the backword induction on Λ with respect to the order "$\geq$". By (**Claim A**) combined with the relations (2.1.1) and (2.1.3)-(2.1.6), for any $u \in \mathcal{S}_q$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda$, we have

$$u \cdot 1_\lambda = \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} a_k E_k 1_\lambda + b \cdot 1_\lambda \qquad (a_k \in \mathcal{S}_q,\ b \in \mathcal{S}_q^-). \tag{2.6.1}$$

Clearly, $b \cdot 1_\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_q^- \mathcal{S}_q^+ \cdot 1_\lambda$. On the other hand, we have $a_k E_k 1_\lambda = a_k 1_{\lambda + \alpha_k} E_k$ by (2.1.3), where we set $1_{\lambda + \alpha_k} = 0$ if $\lambda + \alpha_k \notin \Lambda$.

First, we assume that λ is a maximal element of Λ. Then, for any $k = 1, \cdots, m-1$, we have $\lambda + \alpha_k \notin \Lambda$ since $\lambda + \alpha_k \geq \lambda$ in P and λ is maximal in Λ. Thus, we have $1_{\lambda + \alpha_k} = 0$ for $k = 1, \cdots, m-1$. In this case, we have $u \cdot 1_\lambda = b \cdot 1_\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_q^- \mathcal{S}_q^+ \cdot 1_\lambda$.

Next, we assume that λ is not maximal in Λ, and that $\lambda + \alpha_k \in \Lambda$. In this case, by the induction hypothesis, we have $a_k 1_{\lambda + \alpha_k} \in \mathcal{S}_q^- \mathcal{S}_q^+ \cdot 1_{\lambda + \alpha_k}$. Thus we have $a_k 1_{\lambda + \alpha_k} E_k = a_k E_k 1_\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_q^- \mathcal{S}_q^+ \cdot 1_\lambda$. Combined with (2.6.1), we obtain (**Claim B**), thus the first assertion of the proposition is proven.

Recall that $\mathcal{S}_q^0$ is the subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}_q$ generated by $\{1_\lambda \,|\, \lambda \in \Lambda\}$, and $\{1_\lambda \neq 0 \,|\, \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ is a set of pairwise orthogonal idempotents. Thus, $\{1_\lambda \neq 0 \,|\, \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ gives an $\mathcal{K}$-basis of $\mathcal{S}_q^0$.

On the other hand, a set $\{E_{i_1}E_{i_2}\cdots E_{i_l}\,|\,1\leq i_1,\cdots,i_l\leq m-1,\,l\geq 0\}$ gives a spanning set of $\mathcal{S}_q^+$ over $\mathcal{K}$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}E_{i_1}\cdots E_{i_l}&=\sum_{\lambda\in\varLambda}(E_{i_1}\cdots E_{i_l}1_\lambda)\\&=\sum_{\lambda\in\varLambda}\Big(1_{\lambda+\alpha_{i_1}+\cdots+\alpha_{i_l}}E_{i_1}\cdots E_{i_l}\Big),\end{aligned}$$

we have $E_{i_1}\cdots E_{i_l}=0$ if the integer l is sufficient large. This implies that $\mathcal{S}_q^+$ is finitely generated over $\mathcal{K}$. Similarly, we see that $\mathcal{S}_q^-$ is finitely generated over $\mathcal{K}$. Combined with the triangular decomposition, we conclude that $\mathcal{S}_q$ is finite dimensional. □

The following result was proved in the proof of the above proposition.

Corollary 2.7. $\{1_\lambda\neq 0\,|\,\lambda\in\varLambda\}$ *gives a* $\mathcal{K}$*-basis of* $\mathcal{S}_q^0$*.*

2.8. For each $\lambda\in\varLambda$, we define the following subspaces of $\mathcal{S}_q$;

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_q(\geq\lambda)&=\big\{x1_\mu y\;\big|\;x\in\mathcal{S}_q^-,\,y\in\mathcal{S}_q^+,\,\mu\in\varLambda\text{ such that }\mu\geq\lambda\big\},\\\mathcal{S}_q(>\lambda)&=\big\{x1_\mu y\;\big|\;x\in\mathcal{S}_q^-,\,y\in\mathcal{S}_q^+,\,\mu\in\varLambda\text{ such that }\mu>\lambda\big\}.\end{aligned}$$

By using the triangular decomposition and the defining relations of $\mathcal{S}_q$, one can easily check the following lemma.

Lemma 2.9. *For* $\lambda\in\varLambda$*, both of* $\mathcal{S}_q(\geq\lambda)$ *and* $\mathcal{S}_q(>\lambda)$ *are two-sided ideals of* $\mathcal{S}_q$*.*

2.10. Thanks to Lemma 2.9, for $\lambda\in\varLambda$, $\mathcal{S}_q(\geq\lambda)/\mathcal{S}_q(>\lambda)$ turns out to be an $(\mathcal{S}_q,\mathcal{S}_q)$-bimodule by multiplications. In general, it happens that $\mathcal{S}_q(\geq\lambda)=\mathcal{S}_q(>\lambda)$. So, we take a subset $\varLambda^+=\{\lambda\in\varLambda\,|\,\mathcal{S}_q(\geq\lambda)\neq\mathcal{S}_q(>\lambda)\}$ of $\varLambda$. It is clear that

$$\lambda\in\varLambda^+\text{ if and only if }1_\lambda\notin\mathcal{S}_q(>\lambda).\tag{2.10.1}$$

For $\lambda\in\varLambda^+$, we define a subspace $\Delta(\lambda)$ of $\mathcal{S}_q(\geq\lambda)/\mathcal{S}_q(>\lambda)$ by

$$\Delta(\lambda)=\mathcal{S}_q^-\cdot 1_\lambda+S_q(>\lambda).$$

Note that $E_k1_\lambda=1_{\lambda+\alpha_k}E_k\in\mathcal{S}_q(>\lambda)$ for $k=1,\cdots,m-1$, together with the triangular decomposition, $\Delta(\lambda)$ turns out to be a left $\mathcal{S}_q$-submodule of $\mathcal{S}_q(\geq\lambda)/\mathcal{S}_q(>\lambda)$. Similarly, we can define a right $\mathcal{S}_q$-submodule $\Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$ of $\mathcal{S}_q(\geq\lambda)/\mathcal{S}_q(>\lambda)$ by

$$\Delta^\sharp(\lambda)=1_\lambda\cdot\mathcal{S}_q^++\mathcal{S}_q(>\lambda).$$

For $x\in\mathcal{S}_q^-,y\in\mathcal{S}_q^+$, we denote the coset of $\mathcal{S}_q(\geq\lambda)/\mathcal{S}_q(>\lambda)$ containing $x1_\lambda y$ by $\overline{x1_\lambda y}$. Then, we denote an element of $\Delta(\lambda)$ $\big($resp. $\Delta^\sharp(\lambda)\big)$ by $\overline{x1_\lambda}$ $(x\in\mathcal{S}_q^-)$ $\big($resp. $\overline{1_\lambda y}$ $(y\in\mathcal{S}_q^+)\big)$. It is clear that $\Delta(\lambda)=\mathcal{S}_q\cdot\overline{1_\lambda}$ and $\Delta^\sharp(\lambda)=\overline{1_\lambda}\cdot\mathcal{S}_q$. We can check the following lemma immediately from the definitions.

Lemma 2.11. *For $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, there exists a surjective homomorphism of $(\mathcal{S}_q, \mathcal{S}_q)$-bimodules*

$$\Delta(\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{K}} \Delta^\sharp(\lambda) \to \mathcal{S}_q(\geq \lambda)/\mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda)$$

such that $\overline{x1_\lambda} \otimes \overline{1_\lambda y} \mapsto \overline{x1_\lambda y}$ *for* $x \in \mathcal{S}_q^-$, $y \in \mathcal{S}_q^+$. @

2.12. As will be seen later, if the surjection in Lemma 2.11 gives an isomorphism for any $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$ and $\mathcal{S}_q$ has a certain involution ι, $\mathcal{S}_q$ turns out to be a quasi-hereditary cellular algebra, and $\Delta(\lambda)$ ($\lambda \in \Lambda^+$) is a left cell (standard) module of $\mathcal{S}_q$. In such a case, we can apply a general theory of (quasi-hereditary) cellular algebras. However, in general, we do not know whether $\Delta(\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{K}} \Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{S}_q(\geq \lambda)/\mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda)$ or not (In fact, it happens that $\Delta(\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{K}} \Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$ is not isomorphic to $\mathcal{S}_q(\geq \lambda)/\mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda)$. See Appendix C), and do not know whether $\mathcal{S}_q$ has such an involution. Nevertheless, we develop a certain representation theory of $\mathcal{S}_q$ which is almost similar to the theory of standardly based algebras in the sens of [DR1], and also similar to the theory of cellular algebras (see e.g. [GL], [M, ch.2]).

2.13. For $y \in \mathcal{S}_q^+$, $x \in \mathcal{S}_q^-$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, we have $1_\lambda y x 1_\lambda = 1_\lambda 1_{\lambda+\alpha} y x$ if $\deg(yx) = \alpha$. Thus, we have $1_\lambda y x 1_\lambda = 0$ if $\deg(yx) = \alpha \neq 0$. On the other hand, if $\deg\big(yx\big) = 0$, we can write

$$1_\lambda y x 1_\lambda = r_0 1_\lambda + \sum_{\substack{Y \in \mathcal{S}_q^+, X \in \mathcal{S}_q^- \\ \deg(Y) = -\deg(X) \neq 0}} r_{XY} 1_\lambda X Y 1_\lambda \quad (r_0, r_{XY} \in \mathcal{K}) \tag{2.13.1}$$

by investigating the degrees through the triangular decomposition. These imply, for $y \in \mathcal{S}_q^+$, $x \in \mathcal{S}_q^-$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, that we have

$$1_\lambda y x 1_\lambda \equiv r_{yx} 1_\lambda \mod \mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda) \qquad (r_{yx} \in \mathcal{K}).$$

By using this formula, for $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, we can define a bilinear form $\langle\, ,\, \rangle : \Delta^\sharp(\lambda) \times \Delta(\lambda) \to \mathcal{K}$ such that

$$\langle \overline{1_\lambda y}\, , \overline{x 1_\lambda} \rangle 1_\lambda \equiv 1_\lambda y x 1_\lambda \mod \mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda) \quad \text{for } y \in \mathcal{S}_q^+,\ x \in \mathcal{S}_q^-. \tag{2.13.2}$$

For $\alpha \in Q^+$, put

$$\Upsilon_\alpha = \big\{ (i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_k) \bigm| 1 \leq i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_k \leq m-1 \text{ such that } \alpha_{i_1} + \alpha_{i_2} + \cdots + \alpha_{i_k} = \alpha \big\}.$$

From the definition, for $(i_1, \cdots, i_k) \in \Upsilon_\alpha$, $(j_1, \cdots, j_l) \in \Upsilon_\beta$ ($\alpha, \beta \in Q^+$), we have

$$\langle \overline{1_\lambda E_{i_1} \cdots E_{i_k}}\, , \overline{F_{j_1} \cdots F_{j_l} 1_\lambda} \rangle = 0 \quad \text{if } \alpha \neq \beta. \tag{2.13.3}$$

We have the following lemma.

Lemma 2.14. *For $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, we have the following formulas.*

(i) $\langle \overline{y} \cdot u\, , \overline{x} \rangle = \langle \overline{y}\, , u \cdot \overline{x} \rangle$ *for* $\overline{x} \in \Delta(\lambda)$, $\overline{y} \in \Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$, $u \in \mathcal{S}_q$.

(ii) $(F_{i_1} \cdots F_{i_k} 1_\lambda E_{j_1} \cdots E_{j_l}) \cdot \overline{x} = \langle \overline{1_\lambda E_{j_1} \cdots E_{j_l}}\, , \overline{x} \rangle \overline{F_{i_1} \cdots F_{i_k} 1_\lambda}$ *for* $\overline{x} \in \Delta(\lambda)$ *and* $F_{i_1} \cdots F_{i_k} 1_\lambda E_{j_1} \cdots E_{j_l} \in \mathcal{S}_q(\geq \lambda)$.

Proof. (i) For $x \in \mathcal{S}_q^-$, $y \in \mathcal{S}_q^+$ and $u \in \mathcal{S}_q$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \overline{1_\lambda y} \cdot u\, , \overline{x 1_\lambda} \rangle 1_\lambda &\equiv 1_\lambda y u x 1_\lambda \\ &\equiv \langle \overline{1_\lambda y}\, , u \cdot \overline{x 1_\lambda} \rangle 1_\lambda \quad \mod \mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda).\end{aligned}$$

(ii) For $x \in \mathcal{S}_q^-$ and $F_{i_1} \cdots F_{i_k} 1_\lambda E_{j_1} \cdots E_{j_l} \in \mathcal{S}_q(\geq \lambda)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(F_{i_1} \cdots F_{i_k} 1_\lambda E_{j_1} \cdots E_{j_l}) \cdot \overline{x 1_\lambda} &= \overline{F_{i_1} \cdots F_{i_k} (1_\lambda E_{j_1} \cdots E_{j_l} x 1_\lambda)} \\ &= \overline{F_{i_1} \cdots F_{i_k} \langle \overline{1_\lambda E_{j_1} \cdots E_{j_l}}\, , \overline{x 1_\lambda} \rangle 1_\lambda} \\ &= \langle \overline{1_\lambda E_{j_1} \cdots E_{j_l}}\, , \overline{x 1_\lambda} \rangle \overline{F_{i_1} \cdots F_{i_k} 1_\lambda}.\end{aligned}$$

□

2.15. For $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, let

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{rad} \Delta(\lambda) &= \big\{ \overline{x} \in \Delta(\lambda) \bigm| \langle \overline{y}, \overline{x} \rangle = 0 \text{ for any } \overline{y} \in \Delta^\sharp(\lambda) \big\}, \\ \operatorname{rad} \Delta^\sharp(\lambda) &= \big\{ \overline{y} \in \Delta^\sharp(\lambda) \bigm| \langle \overline{y}, \overline{x} \rangle = 0 \text{ for any } \overline{x} \in \Delta(\lambda) \big\}.\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.14 (i), $\operatorname{rad} \Delta(\lambda)$ (resp. $\operatorname{rad} \Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$) is a left (resp. right) $\mathcal{S}_q$-submodule of $\Delta(\lambda)$ (resp. $\Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$). Put $L(\lambda) = \Delta(\lambda)/\operatorname{rad} \Delta(\lambda)$ and $L^\sharp(\lambda) = \Delta^\sharp(\lambda)/\operatorname{rad} \Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$ We have the following theorem. This theorem is proven in a similar way as in the general theory of standardly based algebras or cellular algebras (see [DR1], [GL], [M, Ch.2]).

Theorem 2.16.

(i) *For $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, $\operatorname{rad} \Delta(\lambda)$ (resp. $\operatorname{rad} \Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$) is the unique proper maximal $\mathcal{S}_q$-submodule of $\Delta(\lambda)$ (resp. $\Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$). Thus, $L(\lambda)$ (resp. $L^\sharp(\lambda)$) is a left (resp. right) absolutely simple $\mathcal{S}_q$-module.*

(ii) *For $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+$, if $L(\mu)$ (resp. $L^\sharp(\mu)$) is a composition factor of $\Delta(\lambda)$ (resp. $\Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$), we have $\lambda \geq \mu$. Thus, $L(\lambda) \cong L(\mu)$ (resp. $L^\sharp(\lambda) \cong L^\sharp(\mu)$) if and only if $\lambda = \mu$. Moreover, the multiplicity of $L(\lambda)$ (resp. $L^\sharp(\lambda)$) in $\Delta(\lambda)$ (resp. $\Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$) is equal to one.*

(iii) *$\big\{ L(\lambda) \bigm| \lambda \in \Lambda^+ \big\}$ (resp. $\big\{ L^\sharp(\lambda) \bigm| \lambda \in \Lambda^+ \big\}$) gives a complete set of non-isomorphic left (resp. right) simple $\mathcal{S}_q$-modules.*

(iv) *$\mathcal{S}_q$ is semisimple if and only if $\Delta(\lambda) \cong L(\lambda)$ and $\Delta^\sharp(\lambda) \cong L^\sharp(\lambda)$ for any $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$.*

Proof. We prove the assertions only for left $\mathcal{S}_q$-modules. The proof is similar for right $\mathcal{S}_q$-modules. (i) It is clear that $\langle \overline{1_\lambda}, \overline{1_\lambda} \rangle = 1$. Thus, we have $\Delta(\lambda) \supsetneqq \operatorname{rad} \Delta(\lambda)$. For $\overline{x} \in \Delta(\lambda) \setminus \operatorname{rad} \Delta(\lambda)$, there exists an element $\overline{y} \in \Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$ such that $\langle \overline{y}, \overline{x} \rangle \neq 0$. Since $\langle\, , \rangle$ is a bilinear form over a field $\mathcal{K}$, we can suppose that $\langle \overline{y}, \overline{x} \rangle = 1$. Let

$$\overline{y} = \sum_{\substack{(j_1, \cdots, j_l) \in \Upsilon_\alpha \\ \alpha \in Q^+}} r_{(j_1, \cdots, j_l)} \overline{1_\lambda E_{j_1} \cdots E_{j_l}}.$$

For $\overline{t} = \overline{F_{i_1}\cdots F_{i_k}1_\lambda} \in \Delta(\lambda)$, put

$$y_{\overline{t}} = F_{i_1}\cdots F_{i_k}1_\lambda\Big(\sum_{\substack{(j_1,\cdots,j_l)\in\Upsilon_\alpha\\ \alpha\in Q^+}} r_{(j_1,\cdots,j_l)}E_{j_l}\cdots E_{j_1}\Big) \in \mathcal{S}_q.$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} y_{\overline{t}}\cdot\overline{x} &= \sum r_{(j_1,\cdots,j_l)}(F_{i_1}\cdots F_{i_k}1_\lambda E_{j_l}\cdots E_{j_1})\cdot\overline{x} \\ &= \sum r_{(j_1,\cdots,j_l)}\langle\overline{1_\lambda E_{j_1}\cdots E_{j_l}}\,,\overline{x}\rangle\overline{F_{i_1}\cdots F_{i_k}1_\lambda} \qquad (\because \text{Lemma 2.14 (ii)}) \\ &= \langle\overline{y},\overline{x}\rangle\overline{F_{i_1}\cdots F_{i_k}1_\lambda} \\ &= \overline{F_{i_1}\cdots F_{i_k}1_\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\Delta(\lambda)$ is generated by $\overline{x}$ as an $\mathcal{S}_q$-module. Since this fact holds for any $\overline{x}\in\Delta(\lambda)\setminus\operatorname{rad}\Delta(\lambda)$, $\operatorname{rad}\Delta(\lambda)$ is the proper unique maximal submodule of $\Delta(\lambda)$.

(ii) For $\lambda\in\varLambda^+$, we have $1_\lambda\cdot L(\lambda)\neq 0$ since $\overline{1_\lambda}\notin\operatorname{rad}\Delta(\lambda)$. On the other hand, one sees easily that $1_\mu\cdot\Delta(\lambda)=0$ for any $\mu\in\varLambda$ such that $\mu\not\leq\lambda$. Thus, if $L(\mu)$ is a composition factor of $\Delta(\lambda)$, we have $1_\mu\cdot\Delta(\lambda)\neq 0$ and $\mu\leq\lambda$. Moreover, one sees that $1_\lambda\cdot\operatorname{rad}\Delta(\lambda)=0$ (note that $\overline{1_\lambda}\notin\operatorname{rad}\Delta(\lambda)$). This implies that $L(\lambda)$ does not appear in $\operatorname{rad}\Delta(\lambda)$ as a composition factor. Thus we have (ii).

(iii) Let $\{\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle},\lambda_{\langle 2\rangle},\cdots,\lambda_{\langle z\rangle}\}$ be such that $i<j$ if $\lambda_{\langle i\rangle}>\lambda_{\langle j\rangle}$. Put $\mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle i\rangle}) = \sum_{j\leq i}\mathcal{S}_q^-1_{\lambda_{\langle j\rangle}}\mathcal{S}_q^+$, then $\mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle i\rangle})$ turns out to be a two-sided ideal of $\mathcal{S}_q$. Thus, we have the following filtration of two-sided ideals.

$$\mathcal{S}_q = \mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle z\rangle})\supset\mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle z-1\rangle})\supset\cdots\supset\mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle})\supset\mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle}) = 0. \tag{2.16.1}$$

One sees easily that $\mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle i\rangle})/\mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle i-1\rangle})\cong\mathcal{S}_q(\geq\lambda_{\langle i\rangle})/\mathcal{S}_q(>\lambda_{\langle i\rangle})$ as $(\mathcal{S}_q,\mathcal{S}_q)$-bimodules for $\lambda_{\langle i\rangle}\in\varLambda$. Moreover, one can check that

$$\mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle i\rangle})\neq\mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle i-1\rangle}) \text{ if and only if } 1_{\lambda_{\langle i\rangle}}\notin\mathcal{S}_q(>\lambda_{\langle i\rangle}) \text{ if and only if } \lambda_{\langle i\rangle}\in\varLambda^+.$$

Let $\varLambda^+ = \{\lambda_{\langle c_1\rangle},\cdots,\lambda_{\langle c_{z'}\rangle}\}$ such that $i<j$ if $c_i<c_j$. Then, we have the following filtration of two-sided ideals.

$$\mathcal{S}_q = \mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle c_{z'}\rangle})\supsetneqq\mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle c_{z'-1}\rangle})\supsetneqq\cdots\supsetneqq\mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle c_1\rangle})\supsetneqq\mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle c_0\rangle}) = 0 \tag{2.16.2}$$

such that $\mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle c_i\rangle})/\mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle c_{i-1}\rangle})\cong\mathcal{S}_q(\geq\lambda_{\langle c_i\rangle})/\mathcal{S}_q(>\lambda_{\langle c_i\rangle})$ as $(\mathcal{S}_q,\mathcal{S}_q)$-bimodules.

By the filtration of $\mathcal{S}_q$ in (2.16.2) and the surjective homomorphism of $(\mathcal{S}_q,\mathcal{S}_q)$-bimodules $\Delta(\lambda)\otimes_{\mathcal{K}}\Delta^\sharp(\lambda)\to\mathcal{S}_q(\geq\lambda)/\mathcal{S}_q(>\lambda)$ for $\lambda\in\varLambda^+$ in Lemma 2.11, any composition factor of $\mathcal{S}_q$ is a composition factor of $\Delta(\lambda)$ for some $\lambda\in\varLambda^+$. Thus, it is enough to show that any composition factor of $\Delta(\lambda)$ ($\lambda\in\varLambda^+$) is isomorphic to $L(\mu)$ for some $\mu\in\varLambda^+$. We prove it by using the induction on $\varLambda^+$.

Let $\lambda\in\varLambda^+$ be a minimal element with respect to the order "$\geq$". We take $\overline{x} = \sum r_{(i_1,\cdots,i_k)}\overline{F_{i_1}\cdots F_{i_k}1_\lambda}\in\operatorname{rad}\Delta(\lambda)$. Put $x = \sum r_{(i_1,\cdots,i_k)}F_{i_1}\cdots F_{i_k}1_\lambda\in\mathcal{S}_q(\geq\lambda)$.

For $\mu \in \Lambda^+$ such that $\lambda \neq \mu$, we have $\mathcal{S}_q(\geq \mu) \cdot x \in \mathcal{S}_q(\geq \lambda) \cap \mathcal{S}_q(\geq \mu) \subset \mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda)$ since both of $\mathcal{S}_q(\geq \lambda)$ and $\mathcal{S}_q(\geq \mu)$ are two-sided ideals of $\mathcal{S}_q$ and λ is a minimal element of Λ^+. This implies that $\mathcal{S}_q(\geq \mu) \cdot \overline{x} = 0$ for any $\mu \in \Lambda^+$ such that $\mu \neq \lambda$. On the other hand, for any $F_{y_1} \cdots F_{y_b} 1_\lambda E_{x_1} \cdots E_{x_a} \in \mathcal{S}_q(\geq \lambda)$, we have

$$(F_{y_1} \cdots F_{y_b} 1_\lambda E_{x_1} \cdots E_{x_a}) \cdot \overline{x} = \langle \overline{1_\lambda E_{x_1} \cdots E_{x_a}}\,,\, \overline{x} \rangle \overline{F_{y_1} \cdots F_{y_b} 1_\lambda} = 0,$$

where the first equation follows Lemma 2.14 (ii), and the second equation follows $\overline{x} \in \operatorname{rad} \Delta(\lambda)$. This implies that $\mathcal{S}_q(\geq \lambda) \cdot \overline{x} = 0$. Together with the above arguments, we have $\mathcal{S}_q \cdot \overline{x} = 0$. In particular, we have $\overline{x} = 1 \cdot \overline{x} = 0$. This means that $\operatorname{rad} \Delta(\lambda) = 0$, and we have $\Delta(\lambda) = L(\lambda)$.

Next, we suppose that $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$ is not minimal. Put

$$\mathcal{S}_q(\not< \lambda) = \sum_{\substack{\mu \in \Lambda \\ \mu \not< \lambda}} \mathcal{S}_q^- 1_\mu \mathcal{S}_q^+ \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{S}_q(\ngeq \lambda) = \sum_{\substack{\mu \in \Lambda \\ \mu \ngeq \lambda}} \mathcal{S}_q^- 1_\mu \mathcal{S}_q^+ .$$

One sees that $\mathcal{S}_q(\not< \lambda)$ and $\mathcal{S}_q(\ngeq \lambda)$ are two-sided ideals of $\mathcal{S}_q$. It is clear that $\mathcal{S}_q(\ngeq \lambda) \cdot \Delta(\lambda) = 0$. Moreover, we see that $\mathcal{S}_q(\geq \lambda) \cdot \operatorname{rad} \Delta(\lambda) = 0$ in a similar way as in the above arguments. Thus, we have $\mathcal{S}_q(\not< \lambda) \cdot \operatorname{rad} \Delta(\lambda) = 0$. This implies that the action of $\mathcal{S}_q$ on $\operatorname{rad} \Delta(\lambda)$ induces the action of $\mathcal{S}_q / \mathcal{S}_q(\not< \lambda)$ on $\operatorname{rad} \Delta(\lambda)$. Thus, any composition factor of $\operatorname{rad} \Delta(\lambda)$ is a composition factor of $\mathcal{S}_q / \mathcal{S}_q(\not< \lambda)$. Moreover, we can take a total order of Λ such that $\mathcal{S}_q(\not< \lambda) = \mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle k \rangle})$ for some k and that $\lambda_{\langle j \rangle} < \lambda$ for any $j = k+1, \cdots, z$. Thus, by Lemma 2.11, any composition factor of $\mathcal{S}_q / \mathcal{S}_q(\not< \lambda)$ is a composition factor of $\Delta(\mu)$ for some $\mu \in \Lambda^+$ such that $\mu < \lambda$. By the induction hypothesis, we see that any composition factor of $\Delta(\mu)$ such that $\mu < \lambda$ is isomorphic to $L(\nu)$ for some $\nu \in \Lambda^+$. It follows that any composition factor of $\operatorname{rad} \Delta(\lambda)$ is isomorphic to $L(\nu)$ for some $\nu \in \Lambda^+$. Since $\Delta(\lambda) / \operatorname{rad} \Delta(\lambda) = L(\lambda)$, we obtain (iii).

(iv) Suppose that $\mathcal{S}_q$ is semisimple, then $L(\lambda)$ and $L(\mu)$ ($\lambda \neq \mu \in \Lambda^+$) belong to different blocks of $\mathcal{S}_q$. On the other hand, $\Delta(\lambda)$ is indecomposable since $\Delta(\lambda)$ has the unique top. Thus, all the composition factors of $\Delta(\lambda)$ belong to the same block. This means that $\Delta(\lambda)$ has only $L(\lambda)$ as composition factors, and we have $\Delta(\lambda) = L(\lambda)$ for any $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$ by (ii). We have $\Delta^\sharp(\lambda) = L^\sharp(\lambda)$ for any $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$ in a similar way.

Next we suppose that $\Delta(\lambda) \cong L(\lambda)$ and $\Delta^\sharp(\lambda) \cong L^\sharp(\lambda)$ for any $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$. Then, the surjective homomorphism of $(\mathcal{S}_q, \mathcal{S}_q)$-bimodules $\Delta(\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{K}} \Delta^\sharp(\lambda) \to \mathcal{S}_q(\geq \lambda) / \mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda)$ in Lemma 2.11 must be isomorphic. Thus, the filtration (2.16.2) implies that

$$\dim_{\mathcal{K}} \mathcal{S}_q = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda^+} (\dim_{\mathcal{K}} \Delta(\lambda))^2 .$$

($\dim_{\mathcal{K}} L(\lambda) = \dim_{\mathcal{K}} L^\sharp(\lambda)$ will be prove in Lemma 3.8.) This implies that $\mathcal{S}_q$ is semisimple. $\square$

2.17. Let $\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0}$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}_q^{\leq 0}$) be the subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}_q$ generated by $\mathcal{S}_q^+$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}_q^-$) and $\mathcal{S}_q^0$. Thus, $\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0}$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}_q^{\leq 0}$) is generated by E_i (resp. F_i) for $i = 1, \cdots, m-1$ and 1_λ for $\lambda \in \Lambda$. For $\lambda \in \Lambda$ such that $1_\lambda \neq 0$ in $\mathcal{S}_q$, let $\theta_\lambda = \mathcal{K} v_\lambda$ be the one dimensional vector space with a basis v_λ. We define a left action of $\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0}$ on θ_λ by

$$1_\mu \cdot v_\lambda = \delta_{\lambda\mu} v_\lambda, \quad E_i \cdot v_\lambda = 0 \quad \text{for } \mu \in \Lambda \text{ and } i = 1, \cdots, m-1.$$

One can check that this action is well-defined for $\lambda \in \Lambda$ such that $1_\lambda \neq 0$. Similarly, we define a right action of $\mathcal{S}_q^{\leq 0}$ on θ_λ by

$$v_\lambda \cdot 1_\mu = \delta_{\lambda\mu} v_\lambda, \quad v_\lambda \cdot F_i = 0 \quad \text{for } \mu \in \Lambda \text{ and } i = 1, \cdots, m-1.$$

We have the following theorem. (A similar theorem for cyclotomic q-Schur algebras has been obtained by [DR2]. The proof given here is similar to the proof given in [DR2].)

Theorem 2.18.

(i) $\{1_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda$ *such that* $1_\lambda \neq 0\}$ *is the complete set of primitive idempotents in* $\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0}$ *and* $\mathcal{S}_q^{\leq 0}$.

(ii) $\{\theta_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda$ *such that* $1_\lambda \neq 0\}$ *is a complete set of non-isomorphic simple left* $\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0}$*-modules, and of non-isomorphic simple right* $\mathcal{S}_q^{\leq 0}$*-modules.*

(iii) *For* $\lambda \in \Lambda$ *such that* $1_\lambda \neq 0$, *we have the following isomorphism of left* $\mathcal{S}_q$*-modules.*

$$\mathcal{S}_q \otimes_{\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0}} \theta_\lambda \cong \begin{cases} \Delta(\lambda) & \text{if } \lambda \in \Lambda^+, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(iv) *For* $\lambda \in \Lambda$ *such that* $1_\lambda \neq 0$, *we have the following isomorphism of right* $\mathcal{S}_q$*-modules.*

$$\theta_\lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{S}_q^{\leq 0}} \mathcal{S}_q \cong \begin{cases} \Delta^\sharp(\lambda) & \text{if } \lambda \in \Lambda^+, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. We show the theorem only for $\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0}$. The proof is similar for $\mathcal{S}_q^{\leq 0}$. Note that

$$1_\lambda E_{i_1} \cdots E_{i_k} 1_\lambda = 1_\lambda 1_{\lambda + \alpha_{i_1} + \cdots + \alpha_{i_k}} E_{i_1} \cdots E_{i_k} = 0$$

for $1 \leq i_1, \cdots, i_k \leq m-1$, $k \geq 1$. Thus, for $\lambda \in \Lambda$ such that $1_\lambda \neq 0$, we have $1_\lambda \mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0} 1_\lambda = \mathcal{K} 1_\lambda$. This implies that 1_λ is a primitive idempotent of $\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0}$ since $1_\lambda \mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0} 1_\lambda \cong \mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0}}(\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0} 1_\lambda)$, and $\dim_{\mathcal{K}} \mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0}}(\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0} 1_\lambda) \geq 2$ if 1_λ is not primitive. Moreover, we have $1 = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} 1_\lambda$, and so $\{1_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda \text{ such that } 1_\lambda \neq 0\}$ is the complete set of primitive idempotents in $\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0}$. Thus, for $\lambda \in \Lambda$ such that $1_\lambda \neq 0$, $\Theta_\lambda = \mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0} 1_\lambda$ is a principal indecomposable $\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0}$-module. By investigating the degrees, $\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0} \cdot (x 1_\lambda)$ is a proper $\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0}$-submodule of Θ_λ for any $x \in \mathcal{S}_q^+$ such that $x \neq 1$. This implies that $\Theta_\lambda / \operatorname{Rad} \Theta_\lambda \cong \theta_\lambda$. Now, we proved (i) and (ii).

Next, we prove (iii). If $\lambda \notin \Lambda^+$, we can write $1_\lambda = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}_q^-, y \in \mathcal{S}_q^+, \mu > \lambda} r_{x,y,\mu}\, x 1_\mu y$ in $\mathcal{S}_q$. Thus, we have

$$1 \otimes \theta_\lambda = \sum_{\nu \in \Lambda} 1_\nu \otimes \theta_\lambda = 1_\lambda \otimes \theta_\lambda = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}_q^-, y \in \mathcal{S}_q^+, \mu > \lambda} r_{x,y,\mu}\, x 1_\mu y \otimes \theta_\lambda = 0.$$

This implies that $\mathcal{S}_q \otimes_{\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0}} \theta_\lambda = \mathcal{S}_q \cdot (1 \otimes \theta_\lambda) = 0$. Hence, we suppose that $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$. Note that $\Delta(\lambda)$ is generated by an element $\overline{1_\lambda}$, and that $\mathcal{S}_q \otimes_{\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0}} \theta_\lambda$ is generated by $1 \otimes v_\lambda$ as $\mathcal{S}_q$-modules. We define a map $f_\lambda : \Delta(\lambda) \to \mathcal{S}_q \otimes_{\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0}} \theta_\lambda$ by $\overline{u \cdot 1_\lambda} \mapsto u \otimes v_\lambda$ for $u \in \mathcal{S}_q$. One can check that f_λ gives a well-defined $\mathcal{S}_q$-homomorphism. On the other hand, we define the map $\widetilde{g}_\lambda : \mathcal{S}_q \times \theta_\lambda \to \Delta(\lambda)$ by $(u, r v_\lambda) \mapsto \overline{r u \cdot 1_\lambda}$ for $u \in \mathcal{S}_q, r \in \mathcal{K}$. One can check that $\widetilde{g}_\lambda$ gives a well-defined $\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0}$-balanced map. Thus, $\widetilde{g}_\lambda$ induces an $\mathcal{S}_q$-homomorphism $g_\lambda : \mathcal{S}_q \otimes_{\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0}} \theta_\lambda \to \Delta(\lambda)$ such that $u \otimes v_\lambda \mapsto \overline{u \cdot 1_\lambda}$. Thus, (iii) is proved. □

2.19. For given $\eta_\Lambda = \{\eta_i^\lambda \,|\, 1 \leq i \leq m-1,\, \lambda \in \Lambda\}$, where $\eta_i^\lambda \in \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q^- \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q^+ 1_\lambda$ such that $\deg(\eta_i^\lambda) = 0$, we take $\eta_i \in \widetilde{U}_q^- \widetilde{U}_q^0 \widetilde{U}_q^+$ $(1 \leq i \leq m-1)$ such that $\widetilde{\Psi}(\eta_i) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \eta_i^\lambda$, and put $\eta = (\eta_1, \cdots, \eta_{m-1})$.

On the other hand, for given $\eta = (\eta_1, \cdots, \eta_{m-1})$, where $\eta_i \in \widetilde{U}_q^- \widetilde{U}_q^0 \widetilde{U}_q^+$ such that $\deg(\eta_i) = 0$, and for given $\Lambda \subset P$, set $\eta_i^\lambda = \widetilde{\Psi}(\eta_i) 1_\lambda$ $(1 \leq i \leq m-1,\, \lambda \in \Lambda)$, and put $\eta_\Lambda = \{\eta_i^\lambda \,|\, 1 \leq i \leq m-1,\, \lambda \in \Lambda\}$.

Under this correspondence, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2.20.

(i) *Let $\mathcal{S}_q^{\eta_\Lambda}$-mod be the category of finite dimensional left $\mathcal{A}_q^{\eta_\Lambda}$-modules. Then $\mathcal{S}_q^{\eta_\Lambda}$-mod is a full subcategory of $\mathcal{O}^\eta$. In particular, when we regard a $\mathcal{S}_q^{\eta_\Lambda}$-module as a $\widetilde{U}_q$-module through the surjection $\Psi : \widetilde{U}_q \to \mathcal{S}_q^{\eta_\Lambda}$, $\Delta(\lambda)$ $(\lambda \in \Lambda^+)$ is a highest weight module, and $L(\lambda)$ $(\lambda \in \Lambda^+)$ is a simple highest weight module with a highest weight λ associated to η.*

(ii) *For each $M \in \mathcal{O}^\eta$, if the set of weight λ such that $M_\lambda \neq 0$ is contained in Λ, then we have $M \in \mathcal{S}_q^{\eta_\Lambda}$-mod, where we regard the $\mathcal{S}_q^{\eta_\Lambda}$-mod as a full subcategory of $\mathcal{O}^\eta$ by (i). In particular, any simple object of $\mathcal{O}^\eta$ is obtained as in Theorem 2.16 through the quotient algebra $\mathcal{S}_q^{\eta_\Lambda}$ for a suitable $\Lambda \subset P_{\geq 0}$, where the choice of Λ depends on the simple object of $\mathcal{O}^\eta$.*

(iii) *$\mathcal{O}^\eta$ is a full subcategory of $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{tri}^\eta$.*

Proof. (i) is clear through the surjection $\Phi : \widetilde{U}_q \to \mathcal{S}_q^{\eta_\Lambda}$, and by the definitions of $\Delta(\lambda)$ and $L(\lambda)$.

We prove (ii). For $M \in \mathcal{O}^\eta$, put $\Lambda_M = \{\lambda \in P_{\geq 0} \,|\, M_\lambda \neq 0\}$. (Note that $M_\lambda = 0$ unless $\lambda \in P_{\geq 0}$ by the condition (e) in the definition of $\mathcal{O}^\eta$.) Since the dimension of M is finite, Λ_M is a finite set. We take a finite subset Λ of $P_{\geq 0}$ such that $\Lambda_M \subset \Lambda$. Then, we can define an action of $\mathcal{S}_q^{\eta_\Lambda}$ on M as follows;

$$E_i \cdot m = e_i \cdot m \qquad\qquad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq m-1,\ m \in M,$$

$$\begin{aligned} F_i \cdot m &= f_i \cdot m && \text{for } 1 \le i \le m-1,\ m \in M, \\ 1_\lambda \cdot m &= \delta_{\lambda\mu} m && \text{for } \lambda \in \varLambda,\ m \in M_\mu. \end{aligned}$$

One can check that this action is well-defined by using the defining relations of $\widetilde{U}_q$ and the definition of $\mathcal{O}^\eta$. We denote this $\mathcal{S}_q^{\eta_\varLambda}$-module by $M^\varLambda$. When we regard $M^\varLambda$ as a $\widetilde{U}_q$-module through the surjection Ψ, $M^\varLambda$ coincides with M. This implies that $M \in \mathcal{S}_q^{\eta_\varLambda}$-mod. Now, the last assertion of (ii) is clear.

Since $\mathcal{S}_q^{\eta_\varLambda}$ has the triangular decomposition compatible with that of $\widetilde{U}_q$, (iii) follows from (ii). □

2.21. We define an algebra anti-automorphism $\iota : \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q \to \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q$ by $\iota(E_i) = F_i$, $\iota(F_i) = E_i$, $\iota(1_\lambda) = 1_\lambda$ and $\iota(\tau_i^\lambda) = \tau_i^\lambda$ for $i = 1, \cdots, m-1$ and $\lambda \in \varLambda$. We can easily check that ι is well-defined. We consider the following conditions;

(C-1) $\iota(\eta_i^\lambda) = \eta_i^\lambda$ for any $i = 1, \cdots, m-1$ and $\lambda \in \varLambda$.

(C-2) $\Delta(\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{K}} \Delta^\sharp(\lambda) \cong \mathcal{S}_q(\ge \lambda)/\mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda)$ as $(\mathcal{S}_q, \mathcal{S}_q)$-bimodules for any $\lambda \in \varLambda^+$.

Thanks to the condition (C-1), ι induces a well-defined algebra anti-automorphism on $\mathcal{S}_q$. In view of the Lemma 2.11, the condition (C-2) is equivalent to the following condition;

(C'-2)
$$\sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}_q^-, y \in \mathcal{S}_q^+} r_{xy} x 1_\lambda y \in \mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda) \Rightarrow \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}_q^-, y \in \mathcal{S}_q^+} r_{xy} \overline{x 1_\lambda} \otimes \overline{1_\lambda y} = 0 \in \Delta(\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{K}} \Delta^\sharp(\lambda).$$

It is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} &u \in \mathcal{S}_q(\ge \lambda) \text{ if and only if } \iota(u) \in \mathcal{S}_q(\ge \lambda), \\ &u \in \mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda) \text{ if and only if } \iota(u) \in \mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\Delta(\lambda) \ni \overline{x} \mapsto \overline{\iota(x)} \in \Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$ gives an isomorphism of $\mathcal{K}$-vector spaces. We consider the filtration of $\mathcal{S}_q$ in (2.16.2). Recall that

$$\mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle c_i \rangle})/\mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle c_{i-1} \rangle}) \cong \mathcal{S}_q(\ge \lambda_{\langle c_i \rangle})/\mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda_{\langle c_i \rangle}) \quad \text{as } (\mathcal{S}_q, \mathcal{S}_q)\text{-bimodules.}$$

Under the condition (C-1) and (C-2), we have the following commutative diagram;

$$\begin{tikzcd} \mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle c_i \rangle})/\mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle c_{i-1} \rangle}) \arrow[r, phantom, "\cong"] \arrow[d, "\iota"] & \Delta(\lambda_{\langle c_i \rangle}) \otimes_{\mathcal{K}} \Delta^\sharp(\lambda_{\langle c_i \rangle}) \arrow[d, "\overline{x} \otimes \overline{y} \mapsto \overline{\iota(y)} \otimes \overline{\iota(x)}"] \\ \mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle c_i \rangle})/\mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle c_{i-1} \rangle}) \arrow[r, phantom, "\cong"] & \Delta(\lambda_{\langle c_i \rangle}) \otimes_{\mathcal{K}} \Delta^\sharp(\lambda_{\langle c_i \rangle}). \end{tikzcd}$$

This implies that $\mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle c_i \rangle})/\mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle c_{i-1} \rangle})$ is a cell ideal of $\mathcal{S}_q/\mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle c_{i-1} \rangle})$ in the sense of [KX]. Thus, $\mathcal{S}_q$ turns out to be a cellular algebra (see [KX, Definition 3.2]), and $\Delta(\lambda)$ ($\lambda \in \varLambda^+$) gives a cell module of $\mathcal{S}_q$. Moreover, we already know that

$\{L(\lambda) \,|\, \lambda \in \Lambda^+\}$ gives a complete set of non-isomorphic simple $\mathcal{S}_q$-modules. Thus, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2.22. *If $\mathcal{S}_q$ satisfies the conditions (C-1) and (C-2), $\mathcal{S}_q$ is a quasi-hereditary cellular algebra.*

§ 3. Specialization to an arbitrary ring

In this section, we define an $\mathcal{A}$-form ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q$ of $\mathcal{S}_q$, and we consider a specialization ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$ of ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q$ to an arbitrary ring R. We will assume some conditions on the choice of $\{\eta_i^\lambda \,|\, 1 \leq i \leq m-1,\ \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ so that, in the case where R is a field, we obtain the properties of ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$ which are similar to those obtained in the previous section, and are compatible with the case where $R = \mathcal{K}$.

3.1. Put $E_i^{(k)} = E_i^k/[k]!$, $F_i^{(k)} = F_i^k/[k]!$. Let ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q$ be the $\mathcal{A}$-subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}_q$ generated by $E_i^{(k)}$, $F_i^{(k)}$ $(1 \leq i \leq m-1,\ k \geq 1)$ and 1_λ $(\lambda \in \Lambda)$. Note that, by Lemma 2.3, we have $\Psi({}_{\mathcal{A}}\widetilde{U}_q) = {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q$.

Let ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q^+$ (resp. ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q^-$) be the $\mathcal{A}$-subalgebra of ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q$ generated by $E_i^{(k)}$ (resp. $F_i^{(k)}$) for $1 \leq i \leq m-1$, $k \geq 0$, and ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q^0$ be the $\mathcal{A}$-subalgebra of ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q$ generated by 1_λ for $\lambda \in \Lambda$. As we have seen in section 2, $\mathcal{S}_q$ has the triangular decomposition $\mathcal{S}_q = \mathcal{S}_q^- \mathcal{S}_q^0 \mathcal{S}_q^+$ over $\mathcal{K}$. However, it may happen that such relations break over $\mathcal{A}$. Hence, the triangular decomposition will hold over $\mathcal{A}$ so that we consider the following condition

$$\textbf{(A-1)} \qquad E_i^{(k)} F_i^{(l)} \in {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q^-\, {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q^0\, {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q^+ \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq m-1,\ k, l \geq 1.$$

Under this assumption, we can prove the following proposition by replacing E_i, F_j $(1 \leq i, j \leq m-1)$ with divided powers $E_i^{(k)}$, $F_j^{(l)}$ $(1 \leq i, j \leq m-1,\ k, l \geq 1)$ in the proof of Proposition 2.6.

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose that (A-1) holds. Then ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q$ has a triangular decomposition*

$$ {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q = {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q^-\, {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q^0\, {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q^+ .$$

Moreover, ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q$ is finitely generated over $\mathcal{A}$.

In the rest of this section, we always assume the condition (A-1).

3.3. Let R be an arbitrary ring, and we take $\xi_0, \xi_1, \cdots, \xi_r \in R$, where ξ_0 is invertible in R. We regard R as an $\mathcal{A}$-module by the homomorphism of rings $\pi : \mathcal{A} \to R$ such that $q \mapsto \xi_0, \gamma_i \mapsto \xi_i$ $(1 \leq i \leq r)$. Then, we obtain the specialized algebra $R \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q$ of ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q$ through the homomorphism π. We denote it by ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$, and denote $1 \otimes x \in R \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q$ simply by x if it does not cause any confusion. Let ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q^+$ (resp. ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q^-$) be the R-subalgebra of ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$ generated by $1 \otimes E_i^{(k)}$ (resp. $1 \otimes F_i^{(k)}$) for $1 \leq i \leq m-1$, $k \geq 0$, and ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q^0$ be the R-subalgebra of ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$ generated by $1 \otimes 1_\lambda$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda$. By Proposition 3.2, we have the triangular decomposition

$$ {}_R\mathcal{S}_q = {}_R\mathcal{S}_q^-\, {}_R\mathcal{S}_q^0\, {}_R\mathcal{S}_q^+ .$$

Thanks to the triangular decomposition, we have the following results which are similar to the case over $\mathcal{K}$. For $\lambda \in \Lambda$, let

$$\begin{aligned} {}_R\mathcal{S}_q(\geq \lambda) &= \big\{ x 1_\mu y \bigm| x \in {}_R\mathcal{S}_q^-,\, y \in {}_R\mathcal{S}_q^+,\, \mu \in \Lambda \text{ such that } \mu \geq \lambda \big\}, \\ {}_R\mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda) &= \big\{ x 1_\mu y \bigm| x \in {}_R\mathcal{S}_q^-,\, y \in {}_R\mathcal{S}_q^+,\, \mu \in \Lambda \text{ such that } \mu > \lambda \big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q(\geq \lambda)$ and ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda)$ are two-sided ideals of ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$. Put

$${}_R\Lambda^+ = \{\lambda \in \Lambda \mid {}_R\mathcal{S}_q(\geq \lambda) \neq {}_R\mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda)\} = \{\lambda \in \Lambda \mid 1_\lambda \notin {}_R\mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda)\}.$$

For $\lambda \in {}_R\Lambda^+$, we define a left (resp. right) ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$-submodule ${}_R\Delta(\lambda)$ (resp. ${}_R\Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$)) of ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q(\geq \lambda)/{}_R\mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda)$ by

$${}_R\Delta(\lambda) = {}_R\mathcal{S}_q^- \cdot 1_\lambda + {}_R\mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda), \quad {}_R\Delta^\sharp(\lambda) = 1_\lambda \cdot {}_R\mathcal{S}_q^+ + {}_R\mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda).$$

Let ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0}$ (resp. ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q^{\leq 0}$) be the subalgebra of ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$ generated by ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q^+$ (resp. ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q^-$) and ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q^0$. For $\lambda \in \Lambda$ such that $1_\lambda \neq 0$ in ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$, let $\theta_\lambda = R v_\lambda$ be the free R-module with a basis v_λ. We define the left action of ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0}$ on θ_λ by

$$1_\mu \cdot v_\lambda = \delta_{\lambda\mu} v_\lambda, \quad E_i^{(k)} \cdot v_\lambda = 0 \quad \text{for } \mu \in \Lambda,\ i = 1, \cdots, m-1 \text{ and } k \geq 1.$$

Similarly, we define a right action of ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q^{\leq 0}$ on θ_λ by

$$v_\lambda \cdot 1_\mu = \delta_{\lambda\mu} v_\lambda, \quad v_\lambda \cdot F_i^{(k)} = 0 \quad \text{for } \mu \in \Lambda,\ i = 1, \cdots, m-1 \text{ and } k \geq 1.$$

We have the following theorem which is shown in a similar way as in the proof of Theorem 2.18.

Theorem 3.4.

(i) *$\{1_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda$ such that $1_\lambda \neq 0\}$ is the complete set of primitive idempotents in ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0}$ and ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q^{\leq 0}$.*

(ii) *$\{\theta_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda$ such that $1_\lambda \neq 0\}$ is a complete set of non-isomorphic simple left ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0}$-modules, and of non-isomorphic simple right ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q^{\leq 0}$-modules.*

(iii) *For $\lambda \in \Lambda$ such that $1_\lambda \neq 0$, we have the following isomorphism of left (resp. right) ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$-modules.*

$${}_R\mathcal{S}_q \otimes_{{}_R\mathcal{S}_q^{\geq 0}} \theta_\lambda \cong \begin{cases} {}_R\Delta(\lambda) & \text{if } \lambda \in {}_R\Lambda^+, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$\theta_\lambda \otimes_{{}_R\mathcal{S}_q^{\leq 0}} {}_R\mathcal{S}_q \cong \begin{cases} {}_R\Delta^\sharp(\lambda) & \text{if } \lambda \in {}_R\Lambda^+, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

3.5. For $\lambda \in {}_R\Lambda^+$, we can define a bilinear form $\langle\,,\,\rangle : {}_R\Delta^\sharp(\lambda) \times {}_R\Delta(\lambda) \to R$ such that

$$\langle \overline{1_\lambda y}\,,\, \overline{x 1_\lambda} \rangle 1_\lambda \equiv 1_\lambda y x 1_\lambda \mod {}_R\mathcal{S}_q(>\lambda) \qquad \text{for } x \in {}_R\mathcal{S}_q^-, y \in {}_R\mathcal{S}_q^+.$$

Put $\operatorname{rad} {}_R\Delta(\lambda) = \{\overline{x} \in {}_R\Delta(\lambda) \mid \langle \overline{y}, \overline{x}\rangle = 0 \text{ for any } \overline{y} \in {}_R\Delta^\sharp(\lambda)\}$, and put ${}_RL(\lambda) = {}_R\Delta(\lambda)/\operatorname{rad} {}_R\Delta(\lambda)$. Similarly, put $\operatorname{rad} {}_R\Delta^\sharp(\lambda) = \{\overline{y} \in {}_R\Delta^\sharp(\lambda) \mid \langle \overline{y}, \overline{x}\rangle = 0 \text{ for any } \overline{x} \in {}_R\Delta(\lambda)\}$, and put ${}_RL^\sharp(\lambda) = {}_R\Delta^\sharp(\lambda)/\operatorname{rad} {}_R\Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$. Then, one can prove the following theorem by replacing E_i, F_j $(1 \leq i, j \leq m-1)$ with divided powers $E_i^{(k)}$, $F_j^{(l)}$ $(1 \leq i, j \leq m-1,\ k, l \geq 1)$ in the proof of Theorem 2.16.

Theorem 3.6. *Suppose that R is a field. Then we have the followimgs.*

(i) *For $\lambda \in {}_R\Lambda^+$, $\operatorname{rad} {}_R\Delta(\lambda)$, (resp. $\operatorname{rad} {}_R\Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$) is a unique proper maximal submodule of ${}_R\Delta(\lambda)$ (resp. ${}_R\Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$). Thus, ${}_RL(\lambda)$ (resp. ${}_RL^\sharp(\lambda)$) is an absolutely simple left (resp. right) ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$-module.*

(ii) *For $\lambda, \mu \in {}_R\Lambda^+$, if ${}_RL(\mu)$ (resp. ${}_RL^\sharp(\mu)$) is a composition factor of ${}_R\Delta(\lambda)$ (resp. ${}_R\Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$), we have $\lambda \geq \mu$. Thus, ${}_RL(\lambda) \cong {}_RL(\mu)$ if and only if $\lambda = \mu$. Moreover, the multiplicity of ${}_RL(\lambda)$ (resp. ${}_RL^\sharp(\lambda)$) in ${}_R\Delta(\lambda)$ (resp. ${}_R\Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$) is equal to one.*

(iii) *$\{ {}_RL(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in {}_R\Lambda^+\}$ (resp. $\{ {}_RL^\sharp(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in {}_R\Lambda^+\}$) gives a complete set of non-isomorphic left (resp. right) simple ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$-modules.*

(iv) *${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$ is semisimple if and only if ${}_R\Delta(\lambda) \cong {}_RL(\lambda)$ and ${}_R\Delta^\sharp(\lambda) \cong {}_RL^\sharp(\lambda)$ for any $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$.*

3.7. Throughout the rest of this section, we assume that R is a field. Since $\operatorname{rad} {}_R\Delta^\sharp(\lambda) \times \operatorname{rad} {}_R\Delta(\lambda)$ is included in the kernel of the bilinear form $\langle\,,\,\rangle : {}_R\Delta^\sharp(\lambda) \times {}_R\Delta(\lambda) \to R$, $\langle\,,\,\rangle$ induces a bilinear form on ${}_RL^\sharp(\lambda) \times {}_RL(\lambda)$. Clearly, this bilinear form is non-degenerate on ${}_RL^\sharp(\lambda) \times {}_RL(\lambda)$. We regard $\operatorname{Hom}_R({}_RL^\sharp(\lambda), R)$ as an left ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$-module by the standard way. Thanks to the associativity of the bilinear form $\langle\,,\,\rangle$ (Lemma 2.14 (i)), the R-homomorphism $G : {}_RL(\lambda) \to \operatorname{Hom}_R({}_RL^\sharp(\lambda), R)$ given by $\overline{x} \mapsto \langle -, \overline{x}\rangle$ turns out to be an ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$-homomorphism. Since $\langle\,,\,\rangle$ is non-degenerate on ${}_RL^\sharp(\lambda) \times {}_RL(\lambda)$, the homomorphism G is not a 0-map. Hence, G is an isomorphism of left ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$-modules since both of ${}_RL(\lambda)$ and $\operatorname{Hom}_R({}_RL^\sharp(\lambda), R)$ are simple. Thus, we have the following lemma (a similar argument holds for ${}_RL^\sharp(\lambda)$).

Lemma 3.8. *Suppose that R is a field. For $\lambda \in {}_R\Lambda^+$, we have the following isomorphisms.*

(i) ${}_RL(\lambda) \cong \operatorname{Hom}_R({}_RL^\sharp(\lambda), R)$ *as left ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$-modules.*

(ii) ${}_RL^\sharp(\lambda) \cong \operatorname{Hom}_R({}_RL(\lambda), R)$ *as right ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$-modules.*

In particular, we have $\dim_R {}_RL(\lambda) = \dim_R {}_RL^\sharp(\lambda)$.

3.9. For $\lambda \in {}_R\Lambda^+$, let ${}_RP(\lambda)$ be the projective cover of ${}_RL(\lambda)$. For $\lambda, \mu \in {}_R\Lambda^+$, we denote the multiplicity of ${}_RL(\mu)$ in the composition series of ${}_RP(\lambda)$ by $[\,{}_RP(\lambda) : {}_RL(\mu)]$. Similarly, we denote the multiplicity of ${}_RL(\mu)$ (resp. ${}_RL^\sharp(\mu)$) in the composition series of ${}_R\Delta(\lambda)$ (resp. ${}_R\Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$) by $[\,{}_R\Delta(\lambda) : {}_RL(\mu)]$ (resp. $[\,{}_R\Delta^\sharp(\lambda) : {}_RL^\sharp(\lambda)]$). We have the following relation concerning with these multiplicities.

Lemma 3.10. *Suppose that R is a field. For $\lambda, \mu \in {}_R\Lambda^+$, we have*

$$[{}_RP(\lambda) : {}_RL(\mu)] \leqq \sum_{\nu \in {}_R\Lambda^+} [{}_R\Delta(\nu) : {}_RL(\mu)][{}_R\Delta^\sharp(\nu) : {}_RL^\sharp(\lambda)].$$

Proof. In the proof, we omit the subscript R as we always consider the objects over R. Let $\Lambda^+ = \{\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle}, \cdots, \lambda_{\langle z\rangle}\}$ be such that $i < j$ if $\lambda_{\langle i\rangle} > \lambda_{\langle j\rangle}$. Then we have the following filtrations of two-sided ideals,

$$\mathcal{S}_q = \mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle z\rangle}) \supsetneqq \mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle z-1\rangle}) \supsetneqq \cdots \supsetneqq \mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle}) \supsetneqq \mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle}) = 0 \tag{3.10.1}$$

such that $\mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle i\rangle})/\mathcal{S}_q(\lambda_{\langle i-1\rangle}) \cong \mathcal{S}_q(\geq \lambda_{\langle i\rangle})/\mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda_{\langle i\rangle})$ as $\mathcal{S}_q$-bimodules. Since $P(\lambda)$ is a left projective $\mathcal{S}_q$-module, the filtration (3.10.1) gives the following filtration of left $\mathcal{S}_q$-modules.

$$P(\lambda) = M_z \supset M_{z-1} \supset \cdots \supset M_1 \supset M_0 = 0$$

such that $M_i/M_{i-1} \cong \big(\mathcal{S}_q(\geq \lambda_{\langle i\rangle})/\mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda_{\langle i\rangle})\big) \otimes_{\mathcal{S}_q} P(\lambda)$. This implies that

$$[P(\lambda) : L(\mu)] = \sum_{\nu \in \Lambda^+} \big[\big(\mathcal{S}_q(\geq \nu)/\mathcal{S}_q(> \nu)\big) \otimes_{\mathcal{S}_q} P(\lambda) : L(\mu)\big]. \tag{3.10.2}$$

Since there exists a surjection $\Delta(\nu) \otimes_R \Delta^\sharp(\nu) \to \mathcal{S}_q(\geq \nu)/\mathcal{S}_q(> \nu)$ of $\mathcal{S}_q$-bimodules, (3.10.2) implies that

$$[P(\lambda) : L(\mu)] \leqq \sum_{\nu \in \Lambda^+} \big[\Delta(\nu) \otimes_R \Delta^\sharp(\nu) \otimes_{\mathcal{S}_q} P(\lambda) : L(\mu)\big].$$

Thus, we should prove that

$$\big[\Delta(\nu) \otimes_R \Delta^\sharp(\nu) \otimes_{\mathcal{S}_q} P(\lambda) : L(\mu)\big] = [\Delta(\nu) : L(\mu)][\Delta^\sharp(\nu) : L^\sharp(\lambda)].$$

Since

$$\big[\Delta(\nu) \otimes_R \Delta^\sharp(\nu) \otimes_{\mathcal{S}_q} P(\lambda) : L(\mu)\big] = [\Delta(\nu) : L(\mu)] \cdot \dim_R \big(\Delta^\sharp(\nu) \otimes_{\mathcal{S}_q} P(\lambda)\big),$$

it is enough to show that $\dim_R \big(\Delta^\sharp(\nu) \otimes_{{}_R\mathcal{S}_q} P(\lambda)\big) = [\Delta^\sharp(\nu) : L^\sharp(\lambda)]$. By a standard theory of finite dimensional algebras over a field, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\dim_R \big(\Delta^\sharp(\nu) \otimes_{\mathcal{S}_q} P(\lambda)\big) &= \dim_R \Big(\operatorname{Hom}_R \big(\big(\Delta^\sharp(\nu) \otimes_{\mathcal{S}_q} P(\lambda), R\big)\big)\\
&= \dim_R \Big(\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{S}_q} \big(P(\lambda), \operatorname{Hom}_R(\Delta^\sharp(\nu), R)\big)\Big)\\
&= [\operatorname{Hom}_R(\Delta^\sharp(\nu), R) : L(\lambda)]\\
&= [\operatorname{Hom}_R(\Delta^\sharp(\nu), R) : \operatorname{Hom}_R(L^\sharp(\lambda), R)] \quad (\text{ Lemma 3.8 })\\
&= [\Delta^\sharp(\nu) : L^\sharp(\lambda)].
\end{aligned}$$

Now the lemma is proven. □

3.11. For $\lambda \in {}_R\Lambda^+$, ${}_R\Delta(\lambda)$ is an indecomposable ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$-module since ${}_R\Delta(\lambda)$ has the unique top. Thus, all the composition factors of ${}_R\Delta(\lambda)$ belong to the same block of ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$.

For $\lambda, \mu \in {}_R\Lambda^+$, we denote by $\lambda \sim \mu$ if there exists a sequence $\lambda = \lambda_0, \lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_k = \mu$ ($\lambda_i \in {}_R\Lambda^+$) such that ${}_R\Delta(\lambda_{i-1})$ and ${}_R\Delta(\lambda_i)$ ($1 \leq i \leq k$) have a common composition factor. Clearly, "$\sim$" gives an equivalent relation on ${}_R\Lambda^+$, and ${}_R\Delta(\lambda)$ and ${}_R\Delta(\mu)$ belong to the same block if $\lambda \sim \mu$. If ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$ satisfies the condition (C-1), one can prove that the converse is also true. To prove it, we prepare the following lemma.

Lemma 3.12. *Suppose that R is a field. If ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$ satisfies the condition (C-1), we have*

$$[\,{}_R\Delta(\lambda) : {}_RL(\mu)] = [\,{}_R\Delta^\sharp(\lambda) : {}_RL^\sharp(\mu)].$$

Proof. Thanks to (C-1), we can define an isomorphism of R-modules $\iota : {}_R\Delta(\lambda) \to {}_R\Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$ via $\overline{x} \mapsto \overline{\iota(x)}$. For $y \in {}_R\mathcal{S}_q^+$ and $x \in {}_R\mathcal{S}_q^-$, we have

$$\langle \overline{1_\lambda y}, \overline{x 1_\lambda} \rangle 1_\lambda \equiv 1_\lambda y x 1_\lambda = 1_\lambda \iota(x) \iota(y) 1_\lambda \equiv \langle \overline{1_\lambda \iota(x)}\,, \overline{\iota(y) 1_\lambda} \rangle 1_\lambda \mod {}_R\mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda).$$

Thus, we have $\langle \overline{y}, \overline{x} \rangle = \langle \overline{\iota(x)}, \overline{\iota(y)} \rangle$ for any $\overline{x} \in {}_R\Delta(\lambda)$ and $\overline{y} \in \Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$. This implies that $\operatorname{rad} {}_R\Delta^\sharp(\lambda) = \{\overline{\iota(x)} \mid \overline{x} \in \operatorname{rad} {}_R\Delta(\lambda)\}$. Therefore, $\iota : {}_R\Delta(\lambda) \to {}_R\Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$ induces an R-isomorphism ${}_RL(\lambda) \to {}_RL^\sharp(\lambda)$. Let ${}_R\Delta(\lambda) = M_0 \supsetneqq M_1 \supsetneqq \cdots \supsetneqq M_k \supsetneqq 0$ be a composition series of ${}_R\Delta(\lambda)$ such that $M_{i-1}/M_i \cong {}_RL(\mu_i)$. By investigating the action of ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$, we see that $\iota({}_R\Delta(\lambda)) = \iota(M_0) \supsetneqq \iota(M_1) \supsetneqq \cdots \supsetneqq \iota(M_k) \supsetneqq 0$ gives a composition series of ${}_R\Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$ such that $\iota(M_{i-1})/\iota(M_i) \cong {}_RL^\sharp(\mu_i)$. This implies the lemma. □

We have the following theorem.

Theorem 3.13. *Suppose that R is a field. If ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$ satisfies the condition (C-1), then $\lambda \sim \mu$ if and only if ${}_R\Delta(\lambda)$ and ${}_R\Delta(\mu)$ belong to the same block of ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$ for $\lambda, \mu \in {}_R\Lambda^+$.*

Proof. As we have already seen the "only if " part, we prove the "if " part. Assume that ${}_R\Delta(\lambda)$ and ${}_R\Delta(\mu)$ belong to the same block. Then ${}_RP(\lambda)$ and ${}_RP(\mu)$ belong to the same block. Thus, there exists a sequence $\lambda = \lambda_0, \lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_k = \mu$ ($\lambda_i \in {}_R\Lambda^+$) such that ${}_RP(\lambda_{i-1})$ and ${}_RP(\lambda_i)$ ($1 \leq i \leq k$) have a common composition factor ${}_RL(\mu_i)$. By Lemma 3.10, there exists $\nu_i, \nu_i' \in {}_R\Lambda^+$ ($1 \leq i \leq k$) such that $[\,{}_R\Delta(\nu_i) : {}_RL(\mu_i)] \neq 0$, $[\,{}_R\Delta^\sharp(\nu_i) : {}_RL^\sharp(\lambda_{i-1})] \neq 0$, $[\,{}_R\Delta(\nu_i') : {}_RL(\mu_i)] \neq 0$, $[\,{}_R\Delta^\sharp(\nu_i') : {}_RL^\sharp(\lambda_i)] \neq 0$. Combined with Lemma 3.12, we have

$$\lambda_{i-1} \sim \nu_i \sim \mu_i \sim \nu_i' \sim \lambda_i$$

for each $1 \leq i \leq k$. Thus we have $\lambda \sim \mu$.

□

3.14. Finally, we consider the following condition;

(**A-2**) For any $\lambda \in {}_{\mathcal{A}}\Lambda^+$, ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\Delta(\lambda)$ is a free $\mathcal{A}$-module, and

$$ {}_{\mathcal{A}}\Delta(\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}\Delta^\sharp(\lambda) \cong {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q(\geq \lambda) / {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda) \quad \text{as } ({}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q, {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q)\text{-bimodules.} $$

We have the following theorem.

Theorem 3.15. *Suppose that the conditions (A-1), (A-2) and (C-1) hold. Then, for an arbitrary ring R and parameters $\xi_0, \xi_1, \cdots, \xi_r \in R$, ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$ is a cellular algebra with respect to the poset Λ^+. In particular, when R is a field, ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$ is a quasi-hereditary cellular algebra.*

Proof. Thanks to (C-1), the map ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\Delta(\lambda) \ni \overline{x} \mapsto \overline{\iota(x)} \in {}_{\mathcal{A}}\Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$ gives an isomorphism of $\mathcal{A}$-modules. Thus, (A-2) implies that ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$ is a free $\mathcal{A}$-module. Now, we can prove that ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q$ is a cellular algebra with respect to the poset ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\Lambda^+$ in a similar way as in the case over $\mathcal{K}$ (Theorem 2.22), and ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\Delta(\lambda)$ ($\lambda \in {}_{\mathcal{A}}\Lambda^+$) is a (left) cell module of ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q$. Thus, for any ring R, ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$ is a cellular algebra with respect to the poset ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\Lambda^+$, and $R \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}\Delta(\lambda)$ ($\lambda \in {}_{\mathcal{A}}\Lambda^+$) is a cell module of ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$.

From now on, we assume that R is a field. It is clear that $1 \otimes 1_\lambda \in {}_R\mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda)$ if $1_\lambda \in {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda)$. This implies that ${}_R\Lambda^+ \subset {}_{\mathcal{A}}\Lambda^+$. Since $R \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}\Delta(\lambda)$ has an element $1 \otimes \overline{1_\lambda}$, we have that $\operatorname{rad}\big(R \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}\Delta(\lambda)\big) \neq R \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}\Delta(\lambda)$ for any $\lambda \in {}_{\mathcal{A}}\Lambda^+$. This implies that ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$ is quasi-hereditary, and that the number of isomorphism classes of simple ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$-modules is equal to ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\Lambda^+$ by the general theory of cellular algebras. On the other hand, we know that the number of isomorphism classes of simple ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$-modules is equal to ${}_R\Lambda^+$ by Theorem 3.6. Thus, we have ${}_R\Lambda^+ = {}_{\mathcal{A}}\Lambda^+$. In particular, we have ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\Lambda^+ = \Lambda^+$ when $R = \mathcal{K}$. □

Remarks 3.16. (i) Let ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q^\natural = {}_{\mathcal{A}}\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q^\natural(\Lambda)$ be the $\mathcal{A}$-subalgebra of $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q$ generated by $E_i, F_i, 1_\lambda, \tau_i^\lambda$ for $1 \leq i \leq m-1, \lambda \in \Lambda$. Clearly, ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q^\natural$ is isomorphic to the associative algebra over $\mathcal{A}$ defined by generators $E_i, F_i, 1_\lambda, \tau_i^\lambda$ and defining relations (2.1.1)-(2.1.9). Moreover, ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q^\natural$ is a homomorphic image of ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\widetilde{U}_q^\natural$, where ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\widetilde{U}_q^\natural$ is the $\mathcal{A}$-subalgebra of $\widetilde{U}_q$ generated by all $e_i, f_i, \tau_i, K_j^\pm, \begin{bmatrix} K_j; 0 \\ t \end{bmatrix}$. For ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q^\natural$, we can take η_Λ, and we can define the quotient algebra ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q^\natural = {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q^{\natural\eta_\Lambda}$ as the case of $\mathcal{S}_q^{\eta_\Lambda}$ (in this case, the condition (A-1) for ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q^\natural$ to have the triangular decomposition is unnecessary since we do not take a divided power). For an arbitrary ring R and parameters $\xi_0, \xi_1, \cdots, \xi_r$, we take the specialized algebra ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q^\natural = R \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q^\natural$. Then, for ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q^\natural$, one can apply similar arguments as in the case of ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$. In particular, similar results to Theorem 3.4, Theorem 3.6, Theorem 3.13 and Theorem 3.15 hold for ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q^\natural$. However, ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q^\natural$ is different from ${}_R\mathcal{S}_q$ in general.

(ii) For any Cartan matrix of finite type, one can define the algebra $\widetilde{U}_q$ and its quotient algebra $\mathcal{S}_q$ associated to a given Cartan matrix in a similar way. In this case, we should take a weight lattice P whose rank is equal to the rank of the root lattice, and we take a finite subset Λ of P to define the quotient algebra $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q$ without taking a subset of P such as $P_{\geq 0}$. We should use a similar arguments as in the proof of [Do, Lemma 3.2] instead of Lemma 2.3 in order to prove a similar statement as in Proposition 2.2. We also remove the condition (e) from the definition of $\mathscr{O}^{\eta}$. Then, we have all statements in §2 and §3 corresponding to a given Cartan matrix.

§ 4. Review on q-Schur algebras of type A

4.1. Let n, m be positive integers, and $\varLambda_{n,1}$ be the set of compositions of n with m parts, namely

$$\varLambda_{n,1} = \big\{\mu = (\mu_1, \cdots, \mu_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m_{\geq 0} \bigm| \mu_1 + \cdots + \mu_m = n\big\}.$$

We regard $\varLambda_{n,1}$ as a subset of P by the injective map from $\varLambda_{n,1}$ to P given by $\mu = (\mu_1, \cdots, \mu_m) \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i \varepsilon_i$. Thus, for $\mu = (\mu_1, \cdots, \mu_m) \in \varLambda_{n,1}$ and α_i $(1 \leq i \leq m-1)$, we have

$$\mu \pm \alpha_i = (\mu_1, \cdots, \mu_{i-1},\, \mu_i \pm 1,\, \mu_{i+1} \mp 1,\, \mu_{i+2}, \cdots, \mu_m).$$

For $\mu \in \varLambda_{n,1}$, the diagram of μ is the set $[\mu] = \{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \,|\, 1 \leq j \leq \mu_i,\, 1 \leq i \leq m\}$, and a μ-tableau is a bijection $\mathfrak{t} : [\mu] \to \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$. Let $\mathfrak{t}^{\mu}$ be the μ-tableau in which the integers $1, 2, \cdots, n$ are attached in the way from left to right, and top to bottom in $[\mu]$. The symmetric group $\mathfrak{S}_n$ acts on the set of μ-tableaux from right by permuting the integers attached in $[\mu]$. For $\mu, \nu \in \varLambda_{n,1}$, a μ-tableau of type ν is a map $T : [\mu] \to \{1, \cdots, m\}$ such that $\nu_i = \sharp\{x \in [\mu] \,|\, T(x) = i\}$. For μ, ν and μ-tableau $\mathfrak{t}$, let $\nu(\mathfrak{t})$ be a μ-tableau of type ν obtained by replacing each entry i in $\mathfrak{t}$ by k if i appear in the k-th row of $\mathfrak{t}^{\nu}$.

For $\mu \in \varLambda_{n,1}$, let $\mathfrak{S}_{\mu}$ be the Young subgroup of $\mathfrak{S}_n$ corresponding to μ, and $\mathscr{D}_{\mu}$ be the set of distinguished representatives of right $\mathfrak{S}_{\mu}$-cosets. For $\mu, \nu \in \varLambda_{n,1}$, $\mathscr{D}_{\mu\nu} = \mathscr{D}_{\mu} \cap \mathscr{D}_{\nu}^{-1}$ is the set of distinguished representatives of $\mathfrak{S}_{\mu}$-$\mathfrak{S}_{\nu}$ double cosets.

4.2. Let R be an integral domain, and q be an invertible element in R. The Iwahori-Hecke algebra ${}_R\mathscr{H}_n$ of the symmetric group $\mathfrak{S}_n$ is the associative algebra over R generated by $T_1, \cdots, T_{n-1}$ with the following defining relations;

$$\begin{aligned} &(T_i - q)(T_i + q^{-1}) && (1 \leq i \leq n-1),\\ &T_i T_{i+1} T_i = T_{i+1} T_i T_{i+1} && (1 \leq i \leq n-2),\\ &T_i T_j = T_j T_i && (|i-j| \geq 2). \end{aligned}$$

For $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, we denote by $\ell(w)$ the length of w, and by T_w the standard basis of ${}_R\mathscr{H}_n$ corresponding to w. We define an anti-automorphism $* : {}_R\mathscr{H}_n \ni x \mapsto x^* \in {}_R\mathscr{H}_n$ by $T_i^* = T_i$ for $i = 1, \cdots, n-1$. Thus, we have $T_w^* = T_{w^{-1}}$ for $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$. For $\mu \in \varLambda_{n,1}$, set $x_{\mu} = \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{\mu}} q^{\ell(w)} T_w$, and we define the right ${}_R\mathscr{H}_n$-module $M^{\mu} = x_{\mu} \cdot {}_R\mathscr{H}_n$. The q-Schur algebra ${}_R\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ associated to ${}_R\mathscr{H}_n$ is defined by

$${}_R\mathscr{S}_{n,1} = \operatorname{End}_{{}_R\mathscr{H}_n}\Big(\bigoplus_{\mu \in \varLambda_{n,1}} M^{\mu}\Big).$$

The following lemma is well known (see e.g. [M, 4.6]).

Lemma 4.3. *For* $\mu,\nu\in\Lambda_{n,1}$ *and* $d\in\mathscr{D}_{\mu\nu}$, *let* $T=\nu(\mathfrak{t}^{\mu}\cdot d)$, $S=\mu(\mathfrak{t}^{\nu}\cdot d^{-1})$. *Then we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{y\in\mathscr{D}_{\nu}\\ \mu(\mathfrak{t}^{\nu}\cdot y)=S}} q^{\ell(y)}T_y^{*}x_{\nu}=\sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_{\mu}d\mathfrak{S}_{\nu}} q^{\ell(w)}T_w=\sum_{\substack{x\in\mathscr{D}_{\mu}\\ \nu(\mathfrak{t}^{\mu}\cdot x)=T}} q^{\ell(x)}x_{\mu}T_x.$$

Thanks to this lemma, for $\mu,\nu\in\Lambda_{n,1}$ and $d\in\mathscr{D}_{\mu\nu}$, we can define an ${}_R\mathscr{H}_n$-module homomorphism $\psi^{d}_{\mu,\nu}:M^{\nu}\to M^{\mu}$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\psi^{d}_{\mu,\nu}(x_{\nu}\cdot h)&=\Big(\sum_{\substack{y\in\mathscr{D}_{\nu}\\ \mu(\mathfrak{t}^{\nu}\cdot y)=S}} q^{\ell(y)}T_y^{*}x_{\nu}\Big)\cdot h\\ &=\Big(\sum_{\substack{x\in\mathscr{D}_{\mu}\\ \nu(\mathfrak{t}^{\mu}\cdot x)=T}} q^{\ell(x)}x_{\mu}T_x\Big)\cdot h \qquad (h\in {}_R\mathscr{H}_n).\end{aligned}$$

We extend this homomorphism to an element of ${}_R\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ by $\psi^{d}_{\mu,\nu}(m_{\tau})=0$ for $m_{\tau}\in M^{\tau}$ with $\tau\in\Lambda_{n,1}$ such that $\tau\neq\nu$. It is known that $\{\psi^{d}_{\mu,\nu}\mid \mu,\nu\in\Lambda_{n,1}, d\in\mathscr{D}_{\mu\nu}\}$ gives a free R-basis of ${}_R\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ (see [M, Theorem 4.7]).

4.4. Next, we define the Borel subalgebras of ${}_R\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ following [DR2]. Let $I(m,n)=\{\mathbf{i}=(i_1,\cdots,i_n)\mid 1\le i_k\le m \text{ for } 1\le k\le n\}$. $\mathfrak{S}_n$ acts on $I(m,n)$ from right by $\mathbf{i}\cdot w=(i_{w(1)},\cdots,i_{w(n)})$ for $\mathbf{i}=(i_1,\cdots,i_n)\in I(m,n)$ and $w\in\mathfrak{S}_n$. We define a partial order "$\succeq$" on $I(m,n)$ by

$$(i_1,\cdots,i_n)\succeq(j_1,\cdots,j_n) \text{ if and only if } i_k\ge j_k \text{ for all } k=1,\cdots,n.$$

For $\lambda\in\Lambda_{n,1}$, put

$$\mathbf{i}_{\lambda}=(\underbrace{1,\cdots,1}_{\lambda_1\text{terms}},\underbrace{2,\cdots,2}_{\lambda_2\text{terms}},\cdots,\underbrace{m,\cdots,m}_{\lambda_m\text{terms}}).$$

For $\mu\in\Lambda_{n,1}$, we set

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_1^{\succeq}(\mu)&=\big\{(\lambda,d)\bigm|\lambda\in\Lambda_{n,1}, d\in\mathscr{D}_{\lambda\mu} \text{ such that } \mathbf{i}_{\lambda}\cdot d\succeq\mathbf{i}_{\mu}\big\},\\ \Omega_1^{\preceq}(\mu)&=\big\{(\lambda,d)\bigm|\lambda\in\Lambda_{n,1}, d\in\mathscr{D}_{\lambda\mu} \text{ such that } \mathbf{i}_{\mu}\cdot d\preceq\mathbf{i}_{\lambda}\big\}.\end{aligned}$$

Let ${}_R\mathscr{S}^{\le 0}_{n,1}$ be the free R-submodule of ${}_R\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ spanned by $\{\psi^{d}_{\lambda,\mu}\mid(\lambda,d)\in\Omega_1^{\succeq}(\mu), \mu\in\Lambda_{n,1}\}$, and ${}_R\mathscr{S}^{\ge 0}_{n,1}$ be the free R-submodule of ${}_R\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ spanned by $\{\psi^{d}_{\mu,\lambda}\mid(\lambda,d)\in\Omega_1^{\preceq}(\mu), \mu\in\Lambda_{n,1}\}$. By [DR2, Theorem 2.3], ${}_R\mathscr{S}^{\le 0}_{n,1}$ (resp. ${}_R\mathscr{S}^{\ge 0}_{n,1}$) becomes a subalgebra of ${}_R\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$.

4.5. We denote ${}_{\mathbb{Q}(q)}\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ (resp. ${}_{\mathbb{Q}(q)}\mathscr{S}^{\le 0}_{n,1}$, ${}_{\mathbb{Q}(q)}\mathscr{S}^{\ge 0}_{n,1}$) simply by $\mathscr{S}$ (resp. $\mathscr{S}^{\le 0}_{n,1}$, $\mathscr{S}^{\ge 0}_{n,1}$). The following theorem is known by several authors.

Theorem 4.6 ([J], [Du], [PW],[DR2], [DP])**.**

(i) *There exists a surjective homomorphism of algebras*

$$\rho:U_q\to\mathscr{S}_{n,1}.$$

(ii) *By restricting* ρ *to* $\mathcal{B}^{\pm}$, *we have the surjective homomorphisms*

$$\rho|_{\mathcal{B}^+} : \mathcal{B}^+ \to \mathscr{S}_{n,1}^{\geq 0}, \quad \rho|_{\mathcal{B}^-} : \mathcal{B}^- \to \mathscr{S}_{n,1}^{\leq 0}.$$

(iii) *By restricting* ρ *to* ${}_{\mathcal{Z}}U_q$, *we have the surjective homomorphism*

$$\rho|_{{}_{\mathcal{Z}}U_q} : {}_{\mathcal{Z}}U_q \to {}_{\mathcal{Z}}\mathscr{S}_{n,1}.$$

(iv) *By restricting* ρ *to* ${}_{\mathcal{Z}}\mathcal{B}^{\pm}$, *we have the surjective homomorphisms*

$$\rho|_{{}_{\mathcal{Z}}\mathcal{B}^+} : {}_{\mathcal{Z}}\mathcal{B}^+ \to {}_{\mathcal{Z}}\mathscr{S}_{n,1}^{\geq 0}, \quad \rho|_{{}_{\mathcal{Z}}\mathcal{B}^-} : {}_{\mathcal{Z}}\mathcal{B}^- \to {}_{\mathcal{Z}}\mathscr{S}_{n,1}^{\leq 0}.$$

We can describe precisely the image of generators of U_q under the homomorphism ρ in Theorem 4.6 as follows.

Proposition 4.7 ([S2])**.**

(i) *For* e_i $(1 \leq i \leq m-1)$, *we have*

$$\rho(e_i) = \sum_{\mu \in \Lambda_{n,1}} q^{-\mu_{i+1}+1} \psi^1_{\mu+\alpha_i,\mu} \ ,$$

where if $\mu + \alpha_i \notin \Lambda_{n,1}$, *we define* $\psi^1_{\mu+\alpha_i,\mu} = 0$.

(ii) *For* f_i $(1 \leq i \leq m-1)$, *we have*

$$\rho(f_i) = \sum_{\mu \in \Lambda_{n,1}} q^{-\mu_i+1} \psi^1_{\mu-\alpha_i,\mu} \ ,$$

where if $\mu - \alpha_i \notin \Lambda_1$, *we define* $\psi^1_{\mu-\alpha_i,\mu} = 0$.

(iii) *For* $K_i^{\pm}$ $(1 \leq i \leq m)$, *we have*

$$\rho(K_i^{\pm}) = \sum_{\mu \in \Lambda_{n,1}} q^{\pm\mu_i} \psi^1_{\mu,\mu} \ .$$

Clearly, $\psi^1_{\mu,\mu}$ *is an identity map on* M^{μ}.

Proof. See Appendix A. □

4.8. By Theorem 4.6, the q-Schur algebra $\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ is a quotient algebra of U_q. Thus, $\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ is generated by the generators of U_q. In [DG], Doty and Giaquinto described the kernel of the surjection $\rho : U_q \to \mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ precisely. Moreover, they also gave a presentation of the q-Schur algebra ${}_{\mathcal{Z}}\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ over $\mathcal{Z}$.

Theorem 4.9 ([DG, Theorem 3.1, Theorem 3.3])**.**

(i) *The q-Schur algebra* $\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ *is isomorphic to the associative algebra over* $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ *generated by* e_i, f_i $(1 \leq i \leq m-1)$ *and* $K_i^{\pm}$ $(1 \leq i \leq m)$ *with the defining relations (1.2.1)-(1.2.6) together with the following two relations.*

$$K_1 K_2 \cdots K_m = q^n, \tag{4.9.1}$$

$$(K_i - 1)(K_i - q)(K_i - q^2)\cdots(K_i - q^n) = 0. \tag{4.9.2}$$

(ii) *${}_{\mathcal{Z}}\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ is the $\mathcal{Z}$-subalgebra of $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ generated by all $e_i^{(k)}, f_i^{(k)}, K_j^{\pm}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} K_j; 0 \\ t \end{bmatrix}$ for $1 \le i \le m-1$, $1 \le j \le m$, $k \ge 1$, $t \ge 1$.*

In [DG], they gave an alternative presentation of $\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ by generators and relations as follows.

Theorem 4.10 ([DG, Theorem 3.4]).

(i) *The q-Schur algebra $\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ is isomorphic to an associative algebra over $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ generated by E_i, F_i $(1 \le i \le m-1)$ and 1_λ $(\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,1})$ with the following defining relations:*

$$1_\lambda 1_\mu = \delta_{\lambda\mu} 1_\lambda, \qquad \sum_{\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,1}} 1_\lambda = 1,$$

$$E_i 1_\lambda = \begin{cases} 1_{\lambda+\alpha_i} E_i & \textit{if } \lambda + \alpha_i \in \varLambda_{n,1}, \\ 0 & \textit{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

$$F_i 1_\lambda = \begin{cases} 1_{\lambda-\alpha_i} F_i & \textit{if } \lambda - \alpha_i \in \varLambda_{n,1}, \\ 0 & \textit{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

$$1_\lambda E_i = \begin{cases} E_i 1_{\lambda-\alpha_i} & \textit{if } \lambda - \alpha_i \in \varLambda_{n,1}, \\ 0 & \textit{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

$$1_\lambda F_i = \begin{cases} F_i 1_{\lambda+\alpha_i} & \textit{if } \lambda + \alpha_i \in \varLambda_{n,1}, \\ 0 & \textit{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

$$E_i F_j - F_j E_i = \delta_{ij} \sum_{\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,1}} [\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1}] 1_\lambda$$

$$E_{i\pm1} E_i^2 - (q + q^{-1}) E_i E_{i\pm1} E_i + E_i^2 E_{i\pm1} = 0$$

$$E_i E_j = E_j E_i \qquad (|i-j| \ge 2)$$

$$F_{i\pm1} F_i^2 - (q + q^{-1}) F_i F_{i\pm1} F_i + F_i^2 F_{i\pm1} = 0$$

$$F_i F_j = F_j F_i \qquad (|i-j| \ge 2)$$

(ii) *${}_{\mathcal{Z}}\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ is the $\mathcal{Z}$-subalgebra of $\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ generated by all $E_i^{(k)}, F_i^{(k)}$ $(1 \le i \le m-1$, $k \ge 1)$ and 1_λ $(\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,1})$.*

Remark 4.11. For $\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,1}$ and $i = 1, \cdots, m-1$, put $\eta_i^\lambda = [\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1}] 1_\lambda$, and $\eta_{\varLambda_{n,1}} = \{\eta_i^\lambda \mid 1 \le i \le m-1, \lambda \in \varLambda_{n,1}\}$. It is clear that $\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{S}_q^{\eta_{\varLambda_{n,1}}}$ defined in 2.5. Clearly, $\mathcal{S}_q^{\eta_{\varLambda_{n,1}}}$ satisfies the condition (C-1). It is known that the q-Schur algebra ${}_{\mathcal{Z}}\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ over $\mathcal{Z}$ has a triangular decomposition which coincides with the triangular decomposition of ${}_{\mathcal{Z}}\mathcal{S}_q$ in Proposition 3.2, and that ${}_{\mathcal{Z}}\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ is a cellular algebra. Moreover, ${}_{\mathcal{Z}}\Delta(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,1}^+$ coincides with a cell module of ${}_{\mathcal{Z}}\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ thanks to Theorem 3.4. In particular, $\varLambda_{n,1}^+$ coincides with the set of partitions of size n (see

[DR2] and [M] for the results on q-Schur algebra ${}_{\mathcal{Z}}\mathscr{S}_{n,1}$). Thus, $\mathscr{S}_{n,1}\big(\cong \mathcal{S}_q^{\eta}(\varLambda_{n,1})\big)$ satisfies the conditions (A-1), (A-2) and (C-1).

In [DP], a presentation of Borel subalgebras $\mathscr{S}_{n,1}^{\leq 0}$ and $\mathscr{S}_{n,1}^{\geq 0}$ was given as follows.

Theorem 4.12 ([DP, Theorem 8.1])**.** *The Borel subalgebra* $\mathscr{S}_{n,1}^{\leq 0}$ *(resp.* $\mathscr{S}_{n,1}^{\geq 0}$*) is isomorphic to the associative algebra generated by* f_i *(resp.* e_i*)* $(1 \leq i \leq m-1)$ *and* $K_i^{\pm}$ $(1 \leq i \leq m)$ *with the defining relations* (1.2.1), (1.2.3), (1.2.6), (4.9.1) *and* (4.9.2) *(resp.* (1.2.1), (1.2.2), (1.2.5), (4.9.1) *and* (4.9.2)*).*

Remark 4.13. The above presentation of Borel subalgebras is not exactly the same as the one given in [DP, Theorem 8.1]. However, it is equivalent to the presentation in [loc. cit.] (see [DP, Remarks 4.4]).

§ 5. REVIEW ON CYCLOTOMIC q-SCHUR ALGEBRAS

5.1. Let R be an integral domain, and we take parameters $q, Q_1, \cdots, Q_r \in R$, where q is invertible in R. The Ariki-Koike algebra ${}_R\mathscr{H}_{n,r}$ associated to $\mathfrak{S}_n \ltimes (\mathbb{Z}/r\mathbb{Z})^n$ is the associative algebra with 1 over R generated by $T_0, T_1, \cdots, T_{n-1}$ with the following defining relations:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(T_0-Q_1)(T_0-Q_2)\cdots(T_0-Q_r)=0, && \\
&(T_i-q)(T_i+q^{-1})=0 && (1\leq i\leq n-1),\\
&T_0T_1T_0T_1=T_1T_0T_1T_0, && \\
&T_iT_{i+1}T_i=T_{i+1}T_iT_{i+1} && (1\leq i\leq n-2),\\
&T_iT_j=T_jT_i && (|i-j|\geq 2).
\end{aligned}$$

The subalgebra of ${}_R\mathscr{H}_{n,r}$ generated by $T_1, \cdots, T_{n-1}$ is isomorphic to the Iwahori-Hecke algebra ${}_R\mathscr{H}_n$. We define an algebra anti-automorphism $*:\ {}_R\mathscr{H}_{n,r} \ni x \mapsto x^* \in {}_R\mathscr{H}_{n,r}$ by $T_i^* = T_i$ for $i = 0, \cdots, n-1$.

5.2. Put

$$\varLambda_{n,r} = \left\{ \mu = (\mu^{(1)}, \cdots, \mu^{(r)}) \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{c} \mu^{(k)} = (\mu_1^{(k)}, \cdots, \mu_n^{(k)}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \\ \sum_{k=1}^r \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i^{(k)} = n \end{array} \right\}.$$

Thus, $\varLambda_{n,r}$ is a set of r-tuples of compositions with n parts whose size is equal to n. Put $m = rn$ and $p_k = (k-1)n$ for $k = 1, \cdots, r$. Then, there exists a bijection from $\varLambda_{n,r}$ to $\varLambda_{n,1}$ such that $\mu \mapsto \overline{\mu}$, where $\overline{\mu} = (\overline{\mu}_1, \overline{\mu}_2, \cdots, \overline{\mu}_m) \in \varLambda_{n,1}$ obtained by $\overline{\mu}_{p_k+i} = \mu_i^{(k)}$.

5.3. For $i = 1, \cdots, n$, put $L_1 = T_0$ and $L_i = T_{i-1}L_{i-1}T_{i-1}$. For $\mu \in \varLambda_{n,r}$, put

$$u_\mu^+ = \prod_{k=1}^{r}\prod_{i=1}^{a_k}(L_i - Q_k), \quad m_\mu = x_{\overline{\mu}}\, u_\mu^+, \quad M^\mu = m_\mu \cdot {}_R\mathscr{H}_{n,r},$$

where $a_k = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} |\mu^{(j)}|$ with $a_1 = 0$. Note that $(m_\mu)^* = m_\mu$, and we define $(M^\mu)^* = {}_R\mathscr{H}_{n,r} \cdot m_\mu$. The cyclotomic q-Schur algebra ${}_R\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ associated to ${}_R\mathscr{H}_{n,r}$ is defined by

$${}_R\mathscr{S}_{n,r} = \operatorname{End}_{{}_R\mathscr{H}_{n,r}}\Big(\bigoplus_{\mu\in\varLambda_{n,r}} M^\mu\Big).$$

The following lemma is well known, and one can check them in direct calculations by using the defining relations of ${}_R\mathscr{H}_{n,r}$.

Lemma 5.4.

(i) *L_i and L_j commute with each other for any $1 \leq i, j \leq n$*
(ii) *T_i and L_j commute with each other if $j \neq i, i+1$.*
(iii) *T_i commute with both of L_iL_{i+1} and $L_i + L_{i+1}$.*
(iv) *For $a \in R$ and $i = 1, \cdots, n-1$, T_i commutes with $\prod_{j=1}^{k}(L_j - a)$ if $k \neq i$.*
(v) *$L_{i+1}T_i = (q-q^{-1})L_{i+1} + T_iL_i, \quad T_iL_{i+1} = (q-q^{-1})L_{i+1} + L_iT_i$.*
(vi) *$L_iT_i = (q^{-1}-q)L_{i+1} + T_iL_{i+1}, \quad T_iL_i = (q^{-1}-q)L_{i+1} + L_{i+1}T_i$.*

5.5. For $\lambda, \mu \in \varLambda_{n,r}$ and $d \in \mathscr{D}_{\overline{\lambda}\overline{\mu}}$ such that $\mathbf{i}_{\overline{\lambda}} \cdot d \succeq \mathbf{i}_{\overline{\mu}}$, we define $\varphi^d_{\lambda,\mu} \in {}_R\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ by

$$\varphi^d_{\lambda,\mu}(m_\nu \cdot h) = \delta_{\mu\nu}\Big(\sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_{\overline{\lambda}} d\mathfrak{S}_{\overline{\mu}}} q^{\ell(w)}T_w\Big)u^+_\mu \cdot h \qquad (\nu \in \varLambda_{n,r},\ h \in {}_R\mathscr{H}_{n,r}).$$

This definition is well-defined by Lemma 4.3, and we have $\varphi^d_{\lambda,\mu} \in \operatorname{Hom}_{{}_R\mathscr{H}_{n,r}}(M^\mu, M^\lambda)$ by [DR2, Lemma 5.6].

For $\lambda, \mu \in \varLambda_{n,r}$ and $d \in \mathscr{D}_{\overline{\mu}\overline{\lambda}}$ such that $\mathbf{i}_{\overline{\lambda}} \succeq \mathbf{i}_{\overline{\mu}} \cdot d$, we have $\mathbf{i}_{\overline{\lambda}} \cdot d^{-1} \succeq \mathbf{i}_{\overline{\mu}}$ and $d^{-1} \in \mathscr{D}_{\overline{\lambda}\overline{\mu}}$ from definitions immediately. Thus, we can define $\varphi^{d^{-1}}_{\lambda,\mu} \in \operatorname{Hom}_{{}_R\mathscr{H}_{n,r}}(M^\mu, M^\lambda)$ as above. On the other hand, by [DJM, Corollary 5.17], we have $\varphi^{d^{-1}}_{\lambda,\mu}(m_\mu) \in (M^\mu)^* \cap M^\lambda$, hence $\big(\varphi^{d^{-1}}_{\lambda,\mu}(m_\mu)\big)^* \in M^\mu \cap (M^\lambda)^*$. Thus, we define $\varphi'^d_{\mu,\lambda} \in {}_R\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ by

$$\varphi'^d_{\mu,\lambda}(m_\nu \cdot h) = \delta_{\lambda\nu}\big(\varphi^{d^{-1}}_{\lambda,\mu}(m_\mu)\big)^* \cdot h \qquad (\nu \in \varLambda_{n,r},\ h \in {}_R\mathscr{H}_{n,r}),$$

and we have $\varphi'^d_{\mu\lambda} \in \operatorname{Hom}_{{}_R\mathscr{H}_{n,r}}(M^\lambda, M^\mu)$.

Let ${}_R\mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}$ (resp. ${}_R\mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r}$) be the free R-submodule of ${}_R\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ spanned by $\{\varphi^d_{\lambda,\mu} \mid (\overline{\lambda}, d) \in \Omega^{\succeq}(\overline{\mu}), \mu \in \varLambda_{n,r}\}$ (resp. $\{\varphi'^d_{\mu,\lambda} \mid (\overline{\lambda}, d) \in \Omega^{\preceq}(\overline{\mu}), \mu \in \varLambda_{n,r}\}$). Then ${}_R\mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}$ (resp. ${}_R\mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r}$) is a subalgebra of ${}_R\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$, and $\{\varphi^d_{\lambda,\mu} \mid (\overline{\lambda}, d) \in \Omega^{\succeq}(\overline{\mu}), \mu \in \varLambda_{n,r}\}$ (resp. $\{\varphi'^d_{\mu,\lambda} \mid (\overline{\lambda}, d) \in \Omega^{\preceq}(\overline{\mu}), \mu \in \varLambda_{n,r}\}$) gives a free R-basis of ${}_R\mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}$ (resp. ${}_R\mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r}$) by [DR2, Lemma 5.12, Theorem 5.13].

Moreover, in [DR2], Du and Rui proved the following theorem.

Theorem 5.6 ([DR2, Theorem 5.13, 5.16])**.**

(i) *There exists an algebra isomorphism $\mathcal{F}^{\leq 0} : {}_R\mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r} \to {}_R\mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,1}$ such that $\mathcal{F}^{\leq 0}(\varphi^d_{\lambda,\mu}) = \psi^d_{\overline{\lambda},\overline{\mu}}$ for $\varphi^d_{\lambda,\mu} \in \{\varphi^d_{\lambda,\mu} \mid (\overline{\lambda}, d) \in \Omega^{\succeq}(\overline{\mu}), \mu \in \varLambda_{n,r}\}$.*
(ii) *There exists an algebra isomorphism $\mathcal{F}^{\geq 0} : {}_R\mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r} \to {}_R\mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,1}$ such that $\mathcal{F}^{\geq 0}(\varphi'^d_{\mu,\lambda}) = \psi^d_{\overline{\mu},\overline{\lambda}}$ for $\varphi'^d_{\mu,\lambda} \in \{\varphi'^d_{\mu,\lambda} \mid (\overline{\lambda}, d) \in \Omega^{\preceq}(\overline{\mu}), \mu \in \varLambda_{n,r}\}$.*

(iii) ${}_R\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ *has a triangular decomposition*

$$ {}_R\mathscr{S}_{n,r} = {}_R\mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r} \cdot {}_R\mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r} = \sum_{\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,r}} {}_R\mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r} \cdot \varphi^1_{\lambda,\lambda} \cdot {}_R\mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r}. $$

§ 6. A CYCLOTOMIC q-SCHUR ALGEBRA AS A QUOTIENT ALGEBRA OF $\widetilde{U}_q$

6.1. As in the previous section, let n, r be positive integers, and put $m = nr$. Let $\varGamma = \{1, \cdots, n\} \times \{1, \cdots, r\}$, and $\varGamma' = \varGamma \setminus \{(n,r)\}$. As a convention, we set $(n+1,k) = (1,k+1)$ and $(0,k+1) = (n,k)$ for $k = 1, \cdots, r-1$. For $(i,k) \in \varGamma$, put $\varepsilon_{(i,k)} = \varepsilon_{p_k+i}$, where $p_k = (k-1)n$. Thus, we can rewrite the weight lattice P by $P = \bigoplus_{(i,k)\in\varGamma} \mathbb{Z}\varepsilon_{(i,k)}$, and we regard $\varLambda_{n,r}$ as a subset of P by the injective map from $\varLambda_{n,r}$ to P given by $\varLambda_{n,r} \ni \mu \mapsto \sum_{(i,k)\in\varGamma} \mu_i^{(k)} \varepsilon_{(i,k)} \in P$. For $(i,k) \in \varGamma$, put $h_{(i,k)} = h_{p_k+i}$, then the dual weight lattice $P^\vee$ can be rewritten as $P^\vee = \bigoplus_{(i,k)\in\varGamma} \mathbb{Z}h_{(i,k)}$. Moreover, for $(i,k) \in \varGamma'$, put $\alpha_{(i,k)} = \alpha_{p_k+i} = \varepsilon_{(i,k)} - \varepsilon_{(i+1,k)}$. Thus, for $\mu \in \varLambda_{n,r}$, $\mu \pm \alpha_{(i,k)}$ makes sense in P.

6.2. For $\mu \in \varLambda_{n,r}$ and $(i,k) \in \varGamma'$, if $\mu + \alpha_{(i,k)} \in \varLambda_{n,r}$ then we have $\mathbf{i}_{\overline{\mu}} \succeq \mathbf{i}_{\overline{\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)}}}$ from definitions. On the other hand, if $\mu - \alpha_{(i,k)} \in \varLambda_{n,r}$ then we have $\mathbf{i}_{\overline{\mu-\alpha_{(i,k)}}} \succeq \mathbf{i}_{\overline{\mu}}$. Then, for $(i,k) \in \varGamma'$, we define an element $\varphi^{\pm}_{(i,k)} \in {}_R\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ by

$$ \begin{aligned} \varphi^{+}_{(i,k)} &= \sum_{\mu \in \varLambda_{n,r}} q^{-\mu_{i+1}^{(k)}+1} \varphi'^{1}_{\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)},\,\mu}\ , \\ \varphi^{-}_{(i,k)} &= \sum_{\mu \in \varLambda_{n,r}} q^{-\mu_{i}^{(k)}+1} \varphi^{1}_{\mu-\alpha_{(i,k)},\,\mu}\ , \end{aligned} $$

where we define $\varphi'^{1}_{\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)},\,\mu} = 0$ (resp. $\varphi^{1}_{\mu-\alpha_{(i,k)},\,\mu} = 0$) if $\mu + \alpha_{(i,k)} \notin \varLambda_{n,r}$ (resp. $\mu - \alpha_{(i,k)} \notin \varLambda_{n,r}$).

For $(i,k) \in \varGamma$, we define $\kappa^{\pm}_{(i,k)} \in {}_R\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ by

$$ \kappa^{\pm}_{(i,k)} = \sum_{\mu \in \varLambda_{n,r}} q^{\pm\mu_i^{(k)}} \varphi^1_{\mu,\mu}, $$

and write $\kappa^{+}_{(i,k)}$ by $\kappa_{(i,k)}$ for simplicity.

For $\mu \in \varLambda_{n,r}$ and $(i,k) \in \varGamma$, put $N = \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} |\mu^{(l)}| + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \mu_j^{(k)}$. By Lemma 5.4, one sees that $(L_{N+1} + L_{N+2} + \cdots + L_{N+\mu_i^{(k)}})$ commutes with m_μ. Thus, we can define $\sigma^{\mu}_{(i,k)} \in {}_R\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ by

$$ \sigma^{\mu}_{(i,k)}(m_\nu \cdot h) = \delta_{\mu,\nu}\big(m_\mu(L_{N+1} + \cdots + L_{N+\mu_i^{(k)}})\big) \cdot h \quad (\nu \in \varLambda_{n,r}\ h \in {}_R\mathscr{H}_{n,r}), $$

where we define $\sigma^{\mu}_{(i,k)} = 0$ if $\mu^{(k)}_i = 0$. Moreover, we define

$$\sigma_{(i,k)} = \sum_{\mu \in \Lambda_{n,r}} \sigma^{\mu}_{(i,k)}.$$

6.3. Recall that $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{Z}[\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_r]$ is a polynomial ring over $\mathcal{Z} = \mathbb{Z}[q, q^{-1}]$ with indeterminate elements $\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_r$, and that $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{Q}(q, \gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_r)$ is the quotient field of $\mathcal{A}$. We denote ${}_{\mathcal{K}}\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ simply by $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$, where we set $Q_i = \gamma_i$ $(1 \le i \le r)$. Now, we can define a surjective homomorphism of $\mathcal{K}$-algebras from $\widetilde{U}_q$ to $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ as in the following proposition.

Proposition 6.4. *There exists a surjective homomorphism* $\widetilde{\rho} : \widetilde{U}_q \to \mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ *such that, for* $(i,k) \in \Gamma'$,

$$\widetilde{\rho}(e_{p_k+i}) = \varphi^{+}_{(i,k)}, \tag{6.4.1}$$

$$\widetilde{\rho}(f_{p_k+i}) = \varphi^{-}_{(i,k)}, \tag{6.4.2}$$

$$\widetilde{\rho}(\tau_{p_k+i}) = \begin{cases} -\gamma_{k+1} \dfrac{\kappa_{(n,k)}\kappa^{-}_{(1,k+1)} - \kappa^{-}_{(n,k)}\kappa_{(1,k+1)}}{q - q^{-1}} \\ \qquad + \kappa_{(n,k)}\kappa^{-}_{(1,k+1)}(q^{-1}\sigma_{(n,k)} - q\sigma_{(1,k+1)}) & (\text{ if } i = n), \\ \dfrac{\kappa_{(i,k)}\kappa^{-}_{(i+1,k)} - \kappa^{-}_{(i,k)}\kappa_{(i+1,k)}}{q - q^{-1}} & (\text{ otherwise }), \end{cases} \tag{6.4.3}$$

and that, for $(i,k) \in \Gamma$,

$$\widetilde{\rho}(K^{\pm}_{p_k+i}) = \kappa^{\pm}_{(i,k)}. \tag{6.4.4}$$

Moreover, by restricting $\widetilde{\rho}$ *to* ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\widetilde{U}_q$, $\widetilde{\rho}|_{{}_{\mathcal{A}}\widetilde{U}_q}$ *gives a surjective homomorphism from* ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\widetilde{U}_q$ *to* ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$.

6.5. The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of the proposition. The following relations are clear from the definitions.

$$\kappa_{(i,k)}\kappa_{(j,l)} = \kappa_{(j,l)}\kappa_{(i,k)}, \quad \kappa_{(i,k)}\kappa^{-}_{(i,k)} = \kappa^{-}_{(i,k)}\kappa_{(i,k)} = 1 \tag{6.5.1}$$

Since $\varphi^{1}_{\nu,\nu}$ is the identity map on M^{ν} and $\sigma^{\mu}_{(i,k)} \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathscr{H}_{n,r}}(M^{\mu}, M^{\mu})$, we have

$$\sigma^{\mu}_{(i,k)}\,\varphi^{1}_{\nu,\nu} = \varphi^{1}_{\nu,\nu}\sigma^{\mu}_{(i,k)} = \delta_{\mu,\nu}\,\sigma^{\mu}_{(i,k)}.$$

This relation combined with (6.5.1) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\kappa_{(j,l)}\big(\kappa_{(n,k)}\kappa^{-}_{(1,k+1)}(q^{-1}\sigma_{(n,k)} - q\sigma_{(1,k+1)})\big) \\ &\qquad = \big(\kappa_{(n,k)}\kappa^{-}_{(1,k+1)}(q^{-1}\sigma_{(n,k)} - q\sigma_{(1,k+1)})\big)\kappa_{(j,l)}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.5.2}$$

6.6. By the definitions of $\varphi^{\pm}_{(i,k)}$, $\kappa^{\pm}_{(i,k)}$, it is clear that $\varphi^{+}_{(i,k)}$ (resp. $\varphi^{-}_{(i,k)}$) for $(i,k) \in \Gamma'$ is included in $\mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r}$ (resp. $\mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}$), and that $\kappa^{\pm}_{(i,k)}$ for $(i,k) \in \Gamma$ is included in both of $\mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r}$ and $\mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}$. Recall, in the case of type A, that there exists a surjective homomorphism $\rho : U_q \to \mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ (Theorem 4.6). Here, we extend this homomorphism to that over $\mathcal{K}$. By using the isomorphism $\mathcal{F}^{\geq 0} : \mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r} \to {}_{\mathcal{K}}\mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,1}$ (resp. $\mathcal{F}^{\leq 0} : \mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r} \to {}_{\mathcal{K}}\mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,1}$) in Theorem 5.6, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 6.7.

(i) *$\mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r}$ is generated by $\varphi^{+}_{(i,k)}$ ($(i,k) \in \Gamma'$) and $\kappa^{\pm}_{(i,k)}$ ($(i,k) \in \Gamma$).*

(ii) *$\mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}$ is generated by $\varphi^{-}_{(i,k)}$ ($(i,k) \in \Gamma'$) and $\kappa^{\pm}_{(i,k)}$ ($(i,k) \in \Gamma$).*

Proof. We show (i) only since (ii) is shown in a similar way. By the above arguments, $\varphi^{+}_{(i,k)}$ and $\kappa^{\pm}_{(i,k)}$ are elements of $\mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r}$. On the other hand, by Proposition 4.7 and Theorem 5.6, we have $\big((\mathcal{F}^{\geq 0})^{-1} \circ \rho\big)(e_{p_k+i}) = \varphi^{+}_{(i,k)}$ and $\big((\mathcal{F}^{\geq 0})^{-1} \circ \rho\big)(K^{\pm}_{p_k+i}) = \kappa^{\pm}_{(i,k)}$. Moreover, ${}_{\mathcal{K}}\mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,1}$ is the image of $\mathcal{B}^{+}$ under ρ by Theorem 4.6 (ii), and $\mathcal{B}^{+}$ is generated by e_i ($1 \leq i \leq m-1$) and $K^{\pm}_i$ ($1 \leq i \leq m$). This implies (i). □

6.8. In the proof of the above proposition, we have a surjection $(F^{\geq 0})^{-1} \circ \rho : \mathcal{B}^{+} \to \mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r}$. Under this surjection, the relations (1.2.2) and (1.2.5) implies the following relations (6.8.1) and (6.8.3). Similarly, the following relations (6.8.2) and (6.8.4) follows from the relations (1.2.3) and (1.2.6).

$$\kappa_{(i,k)} \varphi^{+}_{(j,l)} \kappa^{-}_{(i,k)} = q^{\langle \alpha_{(j,l)}, h_{(i,k)} \rangle} \varphi^{+}_{(j,l)}, \tag{6.8.1}$$

$$\kappa_{(i,k)} \varphi^{-}_{(j,l)} \kappa^{-}_{(i,k)} = q^{-\langle \alpha_{(j,l)}, h_{(i,k)} \rangle} \varphi^{-}_{(j,l)}, \tag{6.8.2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\varphi^{+}_{(i\pm1,k)} (\varphi^{+}_{(i,k)})^2 - (q+q^{-1}) \varphi^{+}_{(i,k)} \varphi^{+}_{(i\pm1,k)} \varphi^{+}_{(i,k)} + (\varphi^{+}_{(i,k)})^2 \varphi^{+}_{(i\pm1,k)} = 0, \\ &\varphi^{+}_{(i,k)} \varphi^{+}_{(j,l)} = \varphi^{+}_{(j,l)} \varphi^{+}_{(i,k)} \qquad (|(p_k+i) - (p_l - j)| \geq 2), \end{aligned} \tag{6.8.3}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\varphi^{-}_{(i\pm1,k)} (\varphi^{-}_{(i,k)})^2 - (q+q^{-1}) \varphi^{-}_{(i,k)} \varphi^{-}_{(i\pm1,k)} \varphi^{-}_{(i,k)} + (\varphi^{-}_{(i,k)})^2 \varphi^{-}_{(i\pm1,k)} = 0, \\ &\varphi^{-}_{(i,k)} \varphi^{-}_{(j,l)} = \varphi^{-}_{(j,l)} \varphi^{-}_{(i,k)} \qquad (|(p_k+i) - (p_l - j)| \geq 2). \end{aligned} \tag{6.8.4}$$

6.9. For $i = 1, \cdots, n-1$, let $s_i = (i, i+1) \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ be the adjacent transposition. For $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda_{n,r}$, put $X^{\nu}_{\mu} = \{x \in \mathscr{D}_{\overline{\mu}} \mid \overline{\nu}(\mathfrak{t}^{\overline{\mu}} \cdot x) = \overline{\nu}(\mathfrak{t}^{\overline{\mu}})\}$. One can check that

$$X^{\mu - \alpha_{(i,k)}}_{\mu} = \big\{1, s_N, (s_N s_{N+1}), \cdots, (s_N s_{N+1} \cdots s_{N+\mu^{(k)}_{i+1}-1})\big\}, \tag{6.9.1}$$

$$X^{\mu}_{\mu - \alpha_{(i,k)}} = \big\{1, s_{N-1}, (s_{N-1} s_{N-2}), \cdots, (s_{N-1} s_{N-2} \cdots s_{N-\mu^{(k)}_{i}+1})\big\}, \tag{6.9.2}$$

$$X^{\mu + \alpha_{(i,k)}}_{\mu} = \big\{1, s_N, (s_N s_{N-1}), \cdots, (s_N s_{N-1} \cdots s_{N-\mu^{(k)}_{i}+1})\big\}, \tag{6.9.3}$$

$$X^{\mu}_{\mu + \alpha_{(i,k)}} = \big\{1, s_{N+1}, (s_{N+1} s_{N+2}), \cdots, (s_{N+1} s_{N+2} \cdots s_{N+\mu^{(k)}_{i+1}-1})\big\}, \tag{6.9.4}$$

where $N = \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} |\mu^{(l)}| + \sum_{j=1}^{i} \mu^{(k)}_j$, and put $\mu^{(k)}_{n+1} = \mu^{(k+1)}_1$ if $i = n$. Then, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 6.10. *For $\mu \in \varLambda_{n,r}$ and $(i,k) \in \varGamma'$, we have the followings.*

(i)
$$\begin{aligned}\varphi^{+}_{(i,k)}(m_\mu) &= q^{-\mu^{(k)}_{i+1}+1} m_{\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)}} \Big(\sum_{y \in X^{\mu}_{\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)}}} q^{\ell(y)} T_y \Big) \\ &= q^{-\mu^{(k)}_{i+1}+1} \Big(\sum_{x \in X_{\mu}^{\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)}}} q^{\ell(x)} T^{*}_x \Big) h^{\mu}_{+(i,k)} m_\mu,\end{aligned}$$

where $h^{\mu}_{+(i,k)} = \begin{cases} 1 & (i \neq n) \\ L_{N+1} - Q_{k+1} & (i = n) \quad (N = |\mu^{(1)}| + \cdots + |\mu^{(k)}|). \end{cases}$

(ii)
$$\begin{aligned}\varphi^{-}_{(i,k)}(m_\mu) &= q^{-\mu^{(k)}_{i}+1} \Big(\sum_{y \in X_{\mu}^{\mu-\alpha_{(i,k)}}} q^{\ell(y)} T^{*}_y \Big) m_\mu \\ &= q^{-\mu^{(k)}_{i}+1} m_{\mu-\alpha_{(i,k)}} h^{\mu}_{-(i,k)} \Big(\sum_{x \in X^{\mu}_{\mu-\alpha_{(i,k)}}} q^{\ell(x)} T_x \Big),\end{aligned}$$

where $h^{\mu}_{-(i,k)} = \begin{cases} 1 & (i \neq n) \\ L_{N} - Q_{k+1} & (i = n) \quad (N = |\mu^{(1)}| + \cdots + |\mu^{(k)}|). \end{cases}$

Proof. One can check them from definitions by using Lemma 4.3. □

This lemma implies the following proposition.

Proposition 6.11. *For $(i,k),(j,l) \in \varGamma'$, we have the following relations.*

(i) *If $(i,k) \neq (j,l)$ then we have*
$$\varphi^{+}_{(i,k)} \varphi^{-}_{(j,l)} - \varphi^{-}_{(j,l)} \varphi^{+}_{(i,k)} = 0.$$

(ii) *If $(i,k) = (j,l)$ and $i \neq n$ then we have*
$$\varphi^{+}_{(i,k)} \varphi^{-}_{(i,k)} - \varphi^{-}_{(i,k)} \varphi^{+}_{(i,k)} = \frac{\kappa_{(i,k)} \kappa^{-}_{(i+1,k)} - \kappa^{-}_{(i,k)} \kappa_{(i+1,k)}}{q - q^{-1}}.$$

(iii) *If $(i,k) = (j,l) = (n,k)$ then we have*
$$\begin{aligned}&\varphi^{+}_{(n,k)} \varphi^{-}_{(n,k)} - \varphi^{-}_{(n,k)} \varphi^{+}_{(n,k)} \\ &\quad = -\gamma_{k+1} \frac{\kappa_{(n,k)} \kappa^{-}_{(1,k+1)} - \kappa^{-}_{(n,k)} \kappa_{(1,k+1)}}{q - q^{-1}} + \kappa_{(n,k)} \kappa^{-}_{(1,k+1)} \big(q^{-1} \sigma_{(n,k)} - q \sigma_{(1,k+1)} \big).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Lemma 6.10, for $\mu \in \varLambda_{n,r}$ and $(i,k),(j,l) \in \varGamma'$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varphi^+_{(i,k)}\varphi^-_{(j,l)}(m_\mu)\\
&\quad = \varphi^+_{(i,k)}\Big(q^{-\mu_j^{(l)}+1} m_{\mu-\alpha_{(j,l)}} h^\mu_{-(j,l)}\Big(\sum_{x \in X^\mu_{\mu-\alpha_{(j,l)}}} q^{\ell(x)}T_x\Big)\Big)\\
&\quad = q^{-\mu_j^{(l)}+1} q^{-(\mu-\alpha_{(j,l)})^{(k)}_{i+1}+1}\, m_\mu \Big(\sum_{y \in X^{(\mu-\alpha_{(j,l)})}_{(\mu-\alpha_{(j,l)})+\alpha_{(i,k)}}} q^{\ell(y)}T_y\Big) h^\mu_{-(j,l)} \Big(\sum_{x \in X^\mu_{\mu-\alpha_{(j,l)}}} q^{\ell(x)}T_x\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varphi^-_{(j,l)}\varphi^+_{(i,k)}(m_\mu)\\
&\quad = \varphi^-_{(i,k)}\Big(q^{-\mu_{i+1}^{(k)}+1} m_{\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)}} \Big(\sum_{x \in X^\mu_{\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)}}} q^{\ell(x)}T_x\Big)\Big)\\
&\quad = q^{-\mu_{i+1}^{(k)}+1} q^{-(\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)})^{(l)}_{j}+1}\, m_\mu h^{\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)}}_{-(j,l)} \Big(\sum_{y \in X^{(\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)})}_{(\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)})-\alpha_{(j,l)}}} q^{\ell(y)}T_y\Big) \Big(\sum_{x \in X^\mu_{\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)}}} q^{\ell(x)}T_x\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

One sees that $q^{-\mu_j^{(l)}+1} q^{-(\mu-\alpha_{(j,l)})^{(k)}_{i+1}+1} = q^{-\mu_{i+1}^{(k)}+1} q^{-(\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)})^{(l)}_{j}+1}$ for any case. Put

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= \Big(\sum_{y \in X^{(\mu-\alpha_{(j,l)})}_{(\mu-\alpha_{(j,l)})+\alpha_{(i,k)}}} q^{\ell(y)}T_y\Big), & B &= \Big(\sum_{x \in X^\mu_{\mu-\alpha_{(j,l)}}} q^{\ell(x)}T_x\Big),\\
C &= \Big(\sum_{y \in X^{(\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)})}_{(\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)})-\alpha_{(j,l)}}} q^{\ell(y)}T_y\Big), & D &= \Big(\sum_{x \in X^\mu_{\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)}}} q^{\ell(x)}T_x\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

(i). First, we assume that $(i,k) \neq (j,l)$. Then we have $h^\mu_{-(j,l)} = h^{\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)}}_{-(j,l)}$, and $h^\mu_{-(j,l)}$ commute with A. If $(p_j+l)-(p_k+i) \neq 1$ then we have $X^{(\mu-\alpha_{(j,l)})}_{(\mu-\alpha_{(j,l)})+\alpha_{(i,k)}} = X^\mu_{\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)}}$ and $X^{(\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)})}_{(\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)})-\alpha_{(j,l)}} = X^\mu_{\mu-\alpha_{(j,l)}}$. Thus, we have $A = D$ and $B = C$. Moreover, one sees that A commute with B. If $(p_j+1)-(p_k+i) = 1$ then we have $X^{(\mu-\alpha_{(j,l)})}_{(\mu-\alpha_{(j,l)})+\alpha_{(i,k)}} = X^{(\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)})}_{(\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)})-\alpha_{(j,l)}}$ and $X^\mu_{\mu-\alpha_{(j,l)}} = X^\mu_{\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)}}$. Hence, we have $A = C$ and $B = D$. This implies (i).

(ii). Next, we assume that $(i,k) = (j,l)$ and $i \neq n$. Then we have $h^\mu_{-(j,l)} = h^{\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)}}_{-(j,l)} = 1$. Put $N = \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} |\mu^{(l)}| + \sum_{j=1}^{i} \mu_j^{(k)}$. Then, by (6.9.4) and (6.9.2), we have that

$$X^{(\mu-\alpha_{(i,k)})}_{(\mu-\alpha_{(i,k)})+\alpha_{(i,k)}} = \big\{1, s_N, (s_N s_{N+1}), \cdots, (s_N s_{N+1} \cdots s_{N+\mu^{(k)}_{i+1}-1})\big\}, \tag{6.11.1}$$

$$X^{(\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)})}_{(\mu+\alpha_{(i,k)})-\alpha_{(i,k)}} = \big\{1, s_N, (s_N s_{N-1}), \cdots, (s_N s_{N-1} \cdots s_{N-\mu^{(k)}_{i}+1})\big\}. \tag{6.11.2}$$

Combined with (6.9.2) and (6.9.4), we have $AB - CD = B - D$. Note that $m_\mu T_w = q^{\ell(w)} m_\mu$ for $w \in \mathfrak{S}_\mu$, then we have

$$(\varphi^+_{(i,k)}\varphi^-_{(i,k)} - \varphi^-_{(i,k)}\varphi^+_{(i,k)})(m_\mu) = q^{-\mu_i^{(k)} - \mu_{i+1}^{(k)}+1} \left(\left(\sum_{a=0}^{\mu_i^{(k)}-1} (q^a)^2 \right) - \left(\sum_{b=0}^{\mu_{i+1}^{(k)}-1} (q^b)^2 \right) \right) m_\mu$$

$$= \frac{\kappa_{(i,k)}\kappa^-_{(i+1,k)} - \kappa^-_{(i,k)}\kappa_{(i+1,k)}}{q - q^{-1}}(m_\mu).$$

This implies (ii).

(iii). Finally, we assume that $(i,k) = (j,l) = (n,k)$. Put $N = \sum_{l=1}^k |\mu^{(k)}|$, then, we have $h^\mu_{-(n,k)} = L_N - Q_{k+1}$ and $h^{\mu+\alpha_{(n,k)}}_{-(n,k)} = L_{N+1} - Q_{k+1}$. Hence, we have

(6.11.3)
$$\begin{aligned}(\varphi^+_{(n,k)}\varphi^-_{(n,k)} - \varphi^-_{(n,k)}\varphi^+_{(n,k)})(m_\mu) =& q^{-\mu_n^{(k)} - \mu_1^{(k)}+1} m_\mu (A \cdot L_N \cdot B - L_{N+1} \cdot C \cdot D) \\ & - Q_{k+1}\, q^{-\mu_n^{(k)} - \mu_1^{(k)}+1} m_\mu (AB - CD).\end{aligned}$$

In a similar way as in the case of (ii), we have

$$q^{-\mu_n^{(k)} - \mu_1^{(k)}+1} m_\mu (AB - CD) = \frac{\kappa_{(n,k)}\kappa^-_{(1,k+1)} - \kappa^-_{(n,k)}\kappa_{(1,k+1)}}{q - q^{-1}}(m_\mu). \tag{6.11.4}$$

By Lemma 5.4, we can prove the following formula by induction on c.

(6.11.5)
$$\begin{aligned}L_N(T_{N-1}T_{N-2}\cdots T_{N-c}) = (q - q^{-1})\Big(& \sum_{\xi=1}^{c} T_{N-1}T_{N-2}\cdots \check{T}_{N-\xi} \cdots T_{N-c} L_{N-\xi+1} \Big) \\ & + T_{N-1}T_{N-2}\cdots T_{N-c} L_{N-c},\end{aligned}$$

where $\check{T}_{N-\xi}$ means removing $T_{N-\xi}$ from the product $T_{N-1}T_{N-2}\cdots T_{N-c}$. Combined this with (6.9.2), we have

(6.11.6)
$$\begin{aligned}L_N \cdot B &= L_N + \sum_{c=1}^{\mu_n^{(k)}-1} \big(q^c\, L_N (T_N T_{N-1} \cdots T_{N-c}) \big) \\ &= L_N + \sum_{c=1}^{\mu_n^{(k)}-1} \Big\{ q^c (q - q^{-1}) \Big(\sum_{\xi=1}^{c} T_{N-1}T_{N-2}\cdots \check{T}_{n-\xi} \cdots T_{N-c} L_{N-\xi+1} \Big) \\ &\qquad + q^c\, T_{N-1}T_{N-2}\cdots T_{N-c} L_{N-c} \Big\}\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= L_N + \sum_{\xi=1}^{\mu_n^{(k)}-1} \Big(\sum_{c=\xi}^{\mu_n^{(k)}-1} q^c (q-q^{-1}) T_{N-1}T_{N-2}\cdots \check{T}_{n-\xi}\cdots T_{N-c}\Big) L_{N-\xi+1} \\
&\quad + \sum_{c=1}^{\mu_n^{(k)}-1} q^c T_{N-1}\cdots T_{N-c} L_{N-c}
\end{aligned}
$$

Similarly, we have

(6.11.7)

$$
\begin{aligned}
L_{N+1}\cdot C &= L_{N+1} + \sum_{\xi=0}^{\mu_n^{(k)}-1} \Big(\sum_{c=\xi}^{\mu_n^{(k)}-1} q^{c+1} (q-q^{-1}) T_N T_{N-1}\cdots \check{T}_{n-\xi}\cdots T_{N-c}\Big) L_{N-\xi+1} \\
&\quad + \sum_{c=0}^{\mu_n^{(k)}-1} q^{c+1} T_N T_{N-1}\cdots T_{N-c} L_{N-c},
\end{aligned}
$$

by using the formula. We also have

(6.11.8)

$$
\begin{aligned}
&L_{N+1}(T_{N+1}T_{N+2}\cdots T_{N+c}) \\
&= \Bigg((q^{-1}-q)^c + \sum_{\xi=1}^{c} (q^{-1}-q)^{c-\xi} \Big(\sum_{\substack{(i_1,\cdots,i_\xi)\text{ s.t.}\\ 1\leq i_1<i_2<\cdots<i_\xi\leq c}} T_{N+i_1}T_{N+i_2}\cdots T_{N+i_\xi}\Big)\Bigg)\cdot L_{N+c+1},
\end{aligned}
$$

which is proved by induction on c thanks to Lemma 5.4. (6.11.6) and (6.11.7), by making use of (6.11.1),(6.11.2), combined with Lemma 5.4 implies that

(6.11.9)

$$
\begin{aligned}
&A\cdot L_N\cdot B - L_{N+1}\cdot C\cdot D \\
&= L_N\cdot B - \Big(1 + q(q-q^{-1}) + \sum_{c=1}^{\mu_n^{(k)}-1} (q^{c+1}(q-q^{-1}) T_{N-1}T_{N-2}\cdots T_{N-c}\Big)\cdot L_{N+1}\cdot D.
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that $m_\mu T_w = q^{\ell(w)} m_\mu$ for $w\in\mathfrak{S}_\mu$, and so (6.11.6) implies that

(6.11.10) $$m_\mu\cdot(L_N\cdot B) = m_\mu\, q^{2(\mu_n^{(k)}-1)}(L_N + L_{N-1} + \cdots + L_{N-\mu_n^{(k)}+1}).$$

Similarly, (6.9.4) and (6.11.8) implies that

(6.11.11)

$$m_\mu \cdot \Big(1 + q(q-q^{-1}) + \sum_{c=1}^{\mu_n^{(k)}-1} (q^{c+1}(q-q^{-1})T_{N-1}T_{N-2}\cdots T_{N-c}\Big) \cdot L_{N+1} \cdot D$$
$$= m_\mu \, q^{2(\mu_n^{(k)})} \, (L_{N+1} + L_{N+2} + \cdots + L_{N+\mu_1^{(k+1)}}).$$

By (6.11.9), (6.11.10) and (6.11.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &q^{-\mu_n^{(k)}-\mu_1^{(k)}+1} m_\mu (A \cdot L_N \cdot B - L_{N+1} \cdot C \cdot D) \\ &= m_\mu \, q^{\mu_n^{(k)}-\mu_1^{(k+1)}} \Big(q^{-1}\big(L_N + L_{N-1} + \cdots + L_{N-\mu_n^{(k)}+1}\big) \\ &\qquad\qquad - q\big(L_{N+1} + L_{N+2} + \cdots + L_{N+\mu_1^{(k+1)}}\big)\Big) \\ &= \kappa_{n,k}\kappa^-_{(1,k+1)}\big(q^{-1}\sigma_{(n,k)} - q\sigma_{(1,k+1)}\big)(m_\mu). \end{aligned} \tag{6.11.12}$$

Now (6.11.3), (6.11.4) and (6.11.12) imply (iii). □

We can now prove Proposition 6.4.

(Proof of Proposition 6.4) . By the relations (6.5.1), (6.5.2) and (6.8.1) – (6.8.4) together with Proposition 6.11, one sees that the homomorphism $\widetilde{\rho}$ in Proposition 6.4 is well-defined. On the other hand, by Proposition 6.7, we have $\widetilde{\rho}(\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^+) = \mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r}$ and $\widetilde{\rho}(\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^-) = \mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}$. Moreover, we know that $\mathscr{S}_{n,r} = \mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}\mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r}$ by Theorem 5.6. Thus, we see that $\widetilde{\rho}$ is surjective.

By Theorem 4.6 (iii) and (iv) combined with Theorem 5.6, $\widetilde{\rho}|_{{}_\mathcal{A}\widetilde{U}_q}$ gives a surjection from ${}_\mathcal{A}\widetilde{U}_q$ to ${}_\mathcal{A}\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$. The proposition is now proved. □

§ 7. Presentations of cyclotomic q-Schur algebras

Recall that $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ is the cyclotomic q-Schur algebra over $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{Q}(q, \gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_r)$ with parameters $q, \gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_r$.

7.1. For presenting cyclotomic q-Schur algebras by generators and relations, we prepare some notations. Let $\mathcal{K}\langle x_1, \cdots, x_{m-1}\rangle$ be the non-commutative polynomial ring over $\mathcal{K}$ with indeterminate elements $x_1, \cdots, x_{m-1}$. Note that $\mathcal{K}\langle x_1, \cdots, x_{m-1}\rangle$ is isomorphic to the free $\mathcal{K}$-algebra generated by $x_1, \cdots, x_{m-1}$. Put $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, \cdots, x_{m-1}\}$. For $(i,k) \in \varGamma'$, set $x_{(i,k)} = x_{p_k+i}$, where $p_k = (k-1)n$. Thus, we have $\mathbf{x} = \{x_{(i,k)} \,|\, (i,k) \in \varGamma'\}$ and $\mathcal{K}\langle x_1, \cdots, x_{m-1}\rangle = \mathcal{K}\langle \mathbf{x}\rangle = \mathcal{K}\langle x_{(i,k)} \,|\, (i,k) \in \varGamma'\rangle$.

For $g(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{K}\langle\mathbf{x}\rangle$, let $g(\varphi^+)$ $\big($resp. $g(\varphi^-)\big)$ be the element of $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ obtained by replacing $x_{(i,k)}$ with $\varphi^+_{(i,k)}$ $\big($resp. $\varphi^-_{(i,k)}\big)$ in $g(\mathbf{x})$. Then, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 7.2. *For $\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,r}$ and $(i,k) \in \varGamma$, there exists an element*

$$g^\lambda_{(i,k)} = \sum_j r_j \, g^-_j(\mathbf{x}) \otimes g^+_j(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{K}\langle\mathbf{x}\rangle \otimes_\mathcal{K} \mathcal{K}\langle\mathbf{x}\rangle \quad \big(r_j \in \mathcal{K},\ g^-_j(\mathbf{x}), g^+_j(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{K}\langle\mathbf{x}\rangle\big)$$

such that $\sigma^{\lambda}_{(i,k)} = \sum_j r_j\, g_j^-(\varphi^-)\, g_j^+(\varphi^+)\, \varphi^1_{\lambda,\lambda}$.

Proof. By Theorem 5.6 (iii), we have $\mathscr{S}_{n,r} = \mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r} \cdot \mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r}$. On the other hand, By Proposition 6.7, $\mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}$ (resp. $\mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r}$) is generated by $\varphi^-_{(i,k)}$ (resp. $\varphi^+_{(i,k)}$) for $(i,k) \in \varGamma'$ and $\kappa^{\pm}_{(i,k)}$ for $(i,k) \in \varGamma$. Recall that $\kappa^{\pm}_{(i,k)} = \sum_{\mu \in \varLambda_{n,r}} q^{\pm \mu_i^{(k)}} \varphi^1_{\mu,\mu}$, and that $\varphi^1_{\mu,\mu}$ is the identity map on M^{μ} and the zero map on M^{τ} $(\tau \neq \mu)$. Moreover, $\{\varphi^1_{\mu,\mu} \,|\, \mu \in \varLambda_{n,r}\}$ is a set of pairwise orthogonal idempotents. Combined with the relation (6.8.1) and (6.8.2), we obtain the lemma. □

7.3. In general, $g^{\lambda}_{(i,k)} \in \mathcal{K}\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \otimes_{\mathcal{K}} \mathcal{K}\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle$ satisfying the condition in Lemma 7.2 is not unique. Throughout the rest of this paper, for $(i,k) \in \varGamma'$ and $\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,r}$, we fix $g^{\lambda}_{(i,k)}$'s once and for all.

Let $\mathcal{K}\langle F_1, \cdots, F_{m-1}, E_1, \cdots, E_{m-1} \rangle$ be the non-commutative polynomial ring over $\mathcal{K}$ with indeterminate elements $F_1, \cdots, F_{m-1}, E_1, \cdots, E_{m-1}$. Put $F = \{F_i \,|\, 1 \leq i \leq m-1\}$ and $E = \{E_i \,|\, 1 \leq i \leq m-1\}$. For $(i,k) \in \varGamma'$, set $F_{(i,k)} = F_{p_k + i}$ and $E_{(i,k)} = E_{p_k+i}$. For $g(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{K}\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle$, let $g(F)$ (resp. $g(E)$) be the element of $\mathcal{K}\langle F \rangle$ (resp. $\mathcal{K}\langle E \rangle$) obtained by replacing $x_{(i,k)}$ with $F_{(i,k)}$ (resp. $E_{(i,k)}$) in $g(\mathbf{x})$. For $g^{\lambda}_{(i,k)} = \sum_j r_j\, g_j^-(\mathbf{x}) \otimes g_j^+(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{K}\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \otimes_{\mathcal{K}} \mathcal{K}\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle$ $((i,k) \in \varGamma,\ \mu \in \varLambda_{n,r})$ in Lemma 7.2, put

$$g^{\lambda}_{(i,k)}(F,E) = \sum_j r_j\, g_j^-(F) \cdot g_j^+(E) \in \mathcal{K}\langle F, E \rangle. \tag{7.3.1}$$

7.4. Let $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$ be the associative algebra over $\mathbb{Q}(q, \gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_r)$ with 1 generated by $E_{(i,k)}, F_{(i,k)}$ $((i,k) \in \varGamma')$ and 1_{λ} $(\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,r})$ with the following defining relations:

$$1_{\lambda} 1_{\mu} = \delta_{\lambda,\mu} 1_{\lambda}, \qquad \sum_{\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,r}} 1_{\lambda} = 1, \tag{7.4.1}$$

$$E_{(i,k)} 1_{\lambda} = \begin{cases} 1_{\lambda + \alpha_{(i,k)}} E_{(i,k)} & \text{if } \lambda + \alpha_{(i,k)} \in \varLambda_{n,r}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{7.4.2}$$

$$F_{(i,k)} 1_{\lambda} = \begin{cases} 1_{\lambda - \alpha_{(i,k)}} F_{(i,k)} & \text{if } \lambda - \alpha_{(i,k)} \in \varLambda_{n,r}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{7.4.3}$$

$$1_{\lambda} E_{(i,k)} = \begin{cases} E_{(i,k)} 1_{\lambda - \alpha_{(i,k)}} & \text{if } \lambda - \alpha_{(i,k)} \in \varLambda_{n,r}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{7.4.4}$$

$$1_{\lambda} F_{(i,k)} = \begin{cases} F_{(i,k)} 1_{\lambda + \alpha_{(i,k)}} & \text{if } \lambda + \alpha_{(i,k)} \in \varLambda_{n,r}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{7.4.5}$$

$$E_{(i,k)} F_{(j,l)} - F_{(j,l)} E_{(i,k)} = \delta_{(i,k),(j,l)} \sum_{\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,r}} \eta^{\lambda}_{(i,k)}, \tag{7.4.6}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & E_{(i\pm1,k)} (E_{(i,k)})^2 - (q + q^{-1}) E_{(i,k)} E_{(i\pm1,k)} E_{(i,k)} + (E_{(i,k)})^2 E_{(i\pm1,k)} = 0, \\ & E_{(i,k)} E_{(j,l)} = E_{(j,l)} E_{(i,k)} \qquad (|(p_k + i) - (p_l + j)| \geq 2), \end{aligned} \tag{7.4.7}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
(7.4.8) \qquad & F_{(i\pm1,k)}(F_{(i,k)})^2-(q+q^{-1})F_{(i,k)}F_{(i\pm1,k)}F_{(i,k)}+(F_{(i,k)})^2F_{(i\pm1,k)}=0,\\
& F_{(i,k)}F_{(j,l)}=F_{(j,l)}F_{(i,k)} \qquad (|(p_k+i)-(p_l+j)|\geq 2),
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\eta^\lambda_{(i,k)}=\begin{cases}\Big(-\gamma_{k+1}[\lambda^{(k)}_n-\lambda^{(k+1)}_1] & \\ \qquad +q^{\lambda^{(k)}_n-\lambda^{(k+1)}_1}\big(q^{-1}\,g^\lambda_{(n,k)}(F,E)-q\,g^\lambda_{(1,k+1)}(F,E)\big)\Big)1_\lambda & \text{if } i=n,\\ [\lambda^{(k)}_i-\lambda^{(k)}_{i+1}]1_\lambda & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}
$$

7.5. It is clear that $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$ is a homomorphic image of $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_q(\Lambda_{n,r})$ defined in Section 2. Thus, $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$ is a homomorphic image of $\widetilde{U}_q$. In fact, as the following lemma shows, $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{S}_q^{\eta_{\Lambda_{n,r}}}$, where $\eta_{\Lambda_{n,r}}=\{\eta^\lambda_{(i,k)}\,|\,(i,k)\in\Gamma',\ \lambda\in\Lambda_{n,r}\}$.

Lemma 7.6. *For $(i,k)\in\Gamma'$ and $\lambda\in\Lambda_{n,r}$, we have $\eta^\lambda_{(i,k)}\in\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^-_q\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^+_q1_\lambda$ and $\deg(\eta^\lambda_{(i,k)})=0$. Thus, $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{S}_q^{\eta_{\Lambda_{n,r}}}$.*

Proof. From the definitions of $g^\lambda_{(n,k)}(F,E)$ and $g^\lambda_{(1,k+1)}(F,E)$, it is clear that $\eta^\lambda_{(i,k)}\in\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^-_q\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^+_q1_\lambda$. Note that $\sigma^\lambda_{(i,k)}\in\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathscr{H}_{n,r}}(M^\lambda,M^\lambda)$, Lemma 7.2 together with the definitions of $\varphi^\pm_{(j,l)}$ imply that $\deg(g^\lambda_{(i,k)}(F,E))=0$. Thus, we have $\deg(\eta^\lambda_{(i,k)})=0$. □

From now on, under the isomorphism $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}\cong\mathcal{S}_q^{\eta_{\Lambda_{n,r}}}$, we apply to $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$ the results in Section 2 and 3 for $\mathcal{S}_q^{\eta_{\Lambda_{n,r}}}$. Recall that $\widetilde{\rho}:\widetilde{U}_q\to\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ and $\Psi:\widetilde{U}_q\to\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$ are surjective homomorphisms of algebras given in Proposition 6.4 and the paragraph 2.5 respectively. We have the following proposition.

Proposition 7.7. *There exists a surjective homomorphism of algebras $\Phi:\mathcal{S}_{n,r}\to\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ such that*

$$
(7.7.1) \qquad \Phi(E_{(i,k)})=\varphi^+_{(i,k)},\ \Phi(F_{(i,k)})=\varphi^-_{(i,k)},\ \Phi(1_\lambda)=\varphi^1_{\lambda,\lambda}.
$$

In particular, the surjection $\widetilde{\rho}:\widetilde{U}_q\to\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ factors through the algebra $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$, namely we have $\widetilde{\rho}=\Phi\circ\Psi$. Moreover, by restricting Φ to ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$, we have a surjective homomorphism $\Phi|_{{}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_{n,r}}:{}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_{n,r}\to{}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$.

Proof. First, we prove that Φ gives a well-defined algebra homomorphism from $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$ to $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$. One can easily check that the relations (7.4.1) – (7.4.5) hold in the images of Φ for corresponding generators. By (6.8.3) and (6.8.4), the relations (7.4.7) and (7.4.8) hold in the image of Φ. Proposition 6.11 together with the definition of $\eta^\lambda_{(i,k)}$ implies that (7.4.6) holds in the image of Φ. Thus, Φ is well-defined. By investigating the images of generators under each map, we have $\widetilde{\rho}=\Phi\circ\Psi$, and Φ is surjective. The last assertion follows from the restriction of $\widetilde{\rho}=\Phi\circ\Psi$ to ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\widetilde{U}_q$ together with Proposition 6.4. □

Since $\varphi^1_{\lambda,\lambda}\neq 0$ in $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ for $\lambda\in\Lambda_{n,r}$, and since Φ is surjective, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 7.8. *For* $\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,r}$, $1_\lambda \neq 0$ *in* $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$.

7.9. For $\lambda = (\lambda^{(1)}, \cdots, \lambda^{(r)}) \in \varLambda_{n,r}$, we say that λ is an r-partition of size n if all $\lambda^{(k)}$ $(1 \leq k \leq r)$ are partitions, namely all $\lambda^{(k)}$ are weakly decreasing sequences. On the other hand, we have $\varLambda^+_{n,r} = \big\{\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,r} \,|\, 1_\lambda \notin \mathcal{S}_{n,r}(>\lambda)\big\}$ by (2.10.1). Then, we obtain the parametrization of the isomorphism classes of simple $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$-modules as follows.

Lemma 7.10. *For* $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}(\cong \mathcal{S}_q^{\eta_{\varLambda_{n,r}}})$*, we have*

$$\varLambda^+_{n,r} = \big\{\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,r} \,|\, \lambda : r\text{-partition}\big\}.$$

In particular, the isomorphism classes of simple $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$*-modules are parametrized by* $\varLambda^+_{n,r}$.

Proof. Let $(i,k) \in \varGamma'$ be such that $i \neq n$. For $a \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,r}$, we can prove, by induction on $a \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ together with (7.4.6), that

$$E^a_{(i,k)} F^a_{(i,k)} 1_\lambda \equiv [a]! \Big(\prod_{j=1}^{a} [\lambda_i^{(k)} - \lambda_{i+1}^{(k)} - a + j] \Big) 1_\lambda \mod \mathcal{S}_{n,r}(>\lambda). \tag{7.10.1}$$

Assume that $\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,r}$ is not an r-partition. Then, there exists i,k such that $\lambda_i^{(k)} < \lambda_{i+1}^{(k)}$, where $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $1 \leq k \leq r$. Thus, by (7.10.1), we have

$$E^{\lambda_i^{(k)}+1}_{(i,k)} F^{\lambda_i^{(k)}+1}_{(i,k)} 1_\lambda \equiv [\lambda_i^{(k)}+1]! \Big(\prod_{j=1}^{\lambda_i^{(k)}+1} [j - \lambda_{i+1}^{(k)} - 1] \Big) 1_\lambda \mod \mathcal{S}_{n,r}(>\lambda). \tag{7.10.2}$$

Since $\lambda - (\lambda_i^{(k)}+1)\alpha_{(i,k)} \notin \varLambda_{n,r}$, the left-hand side of (7.10.2) is equal to 0 by (7.4.3). On the other hand, since $\lambda_i^{(k)} < \lambda_{i+1}^{(k)}$, we have $[\lambda_i^{(k)}+1]!\Big(\prod_{j=1}^{\lambda_i^{(k)}+1}[j-\lambda_{i+1}^{(k)}-1]\Big) \neq 0$. Thus, (7.10.2) implies that $1_\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_{n,r}(>\lambda)$ if λ is not an r-partition. By Theorem 2.16 (iii), the isomorphism classes of simple $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$-modules are parametrized by the set $\{\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,r} \,|\, 1_\lambda \notin \mathcal{S}_{n,r}(>\lambda)\}$. On the other hand, through the surjection $\Phi : \mathcal{S}_{n,r} \to \mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ in Proposition 7.7, one can regard a simple $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$-module as a simple $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$-module. Moreover, it is known that the isomorphism classes of simple $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$-modules are parametrized by the set of r-partitions of size n by [DJM]. Thus, we obtain the lemma.

□

7.11. Since $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$ is a quotient algebra of $\widetilde{U}_q$, one can describe $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$ by generators and relations of $\widetilde{U}_q$ together with some additional relations. Here, we give such additional relations precisely. For $(i,k) \in \varGamma'$ and $\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,r}$, we define $g^\lambda_{(i,k)}(f,e) \in \widetilde{U}_q$ in a similar way as in (7.3.1). Recall the bijection from $\varLambda_{n,r}$ to $\varLambda_{n,1}$ such that $\mu \mapsto \overline{\mu}$ in 5.2. For $\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,r}$, put $K_\lambda = K_{\overline{\lambda}} \in \widetilde{U}_q$, where $K_{\overline{\lambda}}$ is defined in (2.2.1). For

$(i,k) \in \varGamma'$, put

$$g_{(i,k)}(f,e) = \sum_{\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,r}} \Big(g^{\lambda}_{(i,k)}(f,e) K_{\lambda} \Big),$$

and put

$$\eta_{(i,k)} = \begin{cases} \Big(-\gamma_{k+1} \dfrac{K_{(n,k)} K^{-}_{(1,k+1)} - K^{-}_{(n,k)} K_{(1,k+1)}}{q - q^{-1}} \\ \qquad + K_{(n,k)} K^{-1}_{(1,k+1)} \big(q^{-1}\, g_{(n,k)}(f,e) - q\, g_{(1,k+1)}(f,e) \big) \Big) & \text{if } i = n, \\ \dfrac{K_{(i,k)} K^{-}_{(i+1,k)} - K^{-}_{(i,k)} K_{(i+1,k)}}{q - q^{-1}} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $\widetilde{I}_{n,r}$ be the two-sided ideal of $\widetilde{U}_q$ generated by $\tau_{p_k+i} - \eta_{(i,k)}$ $((i,k) \in \varGamma')$, $K_1 K_2 \cdots K_m - q^n$ and $(K_i - 1)(K_i - q)(K_i - q^2) \cdots (K_i - q^n)$ $(1 \leq i \leq m)$. Let $U_{n,r} = \widetilde{U}_q / \widetilde{I}_{n,r}$ be a quotient algebra of $\widetilde{U}_q$. One sees that $U_{n,r}$ is isomorphic to the algebra generated by E_i, F_i $(1 \leq i \leq m-1)$ and $K_i^{\pm}$ $(1 \leq i \leq m)$ with defining relations (1.5.1)-(1.5.3), (1.5.6) and (1.5.7) together with the following relations;

(7.11.1) $$e_{(i,k)} f_{(j,l)} - f_{(j,l)} e_{(i,k)} = \delta_{(i,k),(j,l)} \eta_{(i,k)},$$

(7.11.2) $$K_1 K_2 \cdots K_m = q^n,$$

(7.11.3) $$(K_i - 1)(K_i - q)(K_i - q^2) \cdots (K_i - q^n) = 0,$$

where we identify $e_{(i,k)} \leftrightarrow e_{p_k+i}$, $f_{(i,k)} \leftrightarrow f_{p_k+i}$ and $K^{\pm}_{(i,k)} \leftrightarrow K^{\pm}_{p_k+i}$.

Proposition 7.12. *$\widetilde{I}_{n,r}$ contains the kernel of the surjection $\Psi : \widetilde{U}_q \to \mathcal{S}_{n,r}$. Thus, Ψ induces the surjection $\Psi' : U_{n,r} \to \mathcal{S}_{n,r}$. Moreover, Ψ' gives an isomorphism of algebras.*

Proof. From the definition, we have $\Psi(\eta_{(i,k)}) = \sum_{\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,r}} \eta^{\lambda}_{(i,k)}$, thus we have $\Psi(\tau_{p_k+i} - \eta_{(i,k)}) = 0$. Note that $\Psi(K_i) = \sum_{\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,r}} q^{\overline{\lambda}_i} 1_{\lambda}$, we see easily that $\Psi(K_1 \cdots K_m) = q^n$ and $\Psi\big((K_i - 1)(K_i - q) \cdots (K_i - q^n)\big) = 0$. Thus, we have $\widetilde{I}_{n,r} \subset \operatorname{Ker} \Psi$, and Ψ induces the surjection $\Psi' : U_{n,r} \to \mathcal{S}_{n,r}$.

Let $U^0_{n,r}$ be the subalgebra of $U_{n,r}$ generated by K_i $(1 \leq i \leq m)$. In a similar way as the proof of [DDPW, Lemma 13.39], the restriction of Ψ' to $U^0_{n,r}$ gives an isomorphism $U^0_{n,r} \cong \mathcal{S}^0_{n,r}$ (Note that, in the proof of [DDPW, Lemma 13.39], they only use the relations of K_i's which coincide with the relations in $U^0_{n,r}$). Through the isomorphism $U^0_{n,r} \cong \mathcal{S}^0_{n,r}$, we have

(7.12.1) $$K_{\lambda} K_{\mu} = \delta_{\lambda,\mu} K_{\lambda}, \qquad \sum_{\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,r}} K_{\lambda} = 1$$

in $U_{n,r}$. Moreover, for $1 \le i \le m$ and $\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,r}$, we have $K_i K_\lambda = q^{\overline{\lambda}_i} K_\lambda$, thus we have

$$K_i = K_i\big(\sum_{\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,r}} K_\lambda\big) = \sum_{\lambda \in \varLambda_{n,r}} q^{\overline{\lambda}_i} K_\lambda. \tag{7.12.2}$$

Let $\Psi^\dagger : \mathcal{S}_{n,r} \to U_{n,r}$ be a homomorphism of algebras given by $\Psi^\dagger(E_{(i,k)}) = e_{(i,k)}$, $\Psi^\dagger(F_{(i,k)}) = f_{(i,k)}$ and $\Psi^\dagger(1_\lambda) = K_\lambda$. In order to see that $\Psi^\dagger$ is well-defined, we may check the relations (7.4.1)-(7.4.8) in the image of $\Psi^\dagger$ for corresponding generators. The relation (7.4.1) follows from (7.12.1). We can check the relations (7.4.2)-(7.4.5) in a similar way as in the proof of [DDPW, Lemma 13.40]. The relation (7.4.6) follows from the definition of $\eta_{(i,k)}$. The relation (7.4.7) and (7.4.8) are just (1.5.6) and (1.5.7) respectively. Thus, $\Psi^\dagger$ is well-defined. Moreover, by (7.12.2), we see that $\Psi^\dagger$ is surjective and gives the inverse map of Φ', thus we have $U_{n,r} \cong \mathcal{S}_{n,r}$. □

7.13. Our goal is to show that the surjection $\Phi : \mathcal{S}_{n,r} \to \mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ in Proposition 7.7 is actually an isomorphism. Let

$$\big\{\varphi_{ST} \bigm| S, T \in \mathcal{T}(\lambda) \text{ for some } \lambda \in \varLambda^+_{n,r}\big\}$$

be a cellular basis of $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ constructed in [DJM], where $\mathcal{T}(\lambda)$ is the set of semi-standard tableaux of shape λ (see [DJM] for the definition). For $\lambda \in \varLambda^+_{n,r}$, let $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}(\ge \lambda)$ (resp. $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}(> \lambda)$) be a subspace of $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ spanned by $\{\varphi_{ST} \,|\, S, T \in \mathcal{T}(\mu)$ for some $\mu \in \varLambda^+_{n,r}$ such that $\mu \ge \lambda\}$ (resp. $\{\varphi_{ST} \,|\, S, T \in \mathcal{T}(\mu)$ for some $\mu \in \varLambda^+_{n,r}$ such that $\mu > \lambda\}$), then both of $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}(\ge \lambda)$ and $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}(> \lambda)$ are two-sided ideals of $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$.

It is known that $\varphi^1_{\lambda,\lambda} \in \mathscr{S}_{n,r}(\ge \lambda) \setminus \mathscr{S}_{n,r}(> \lambda)$ for $\lambda \in \varLambda^+_{n,r}$ ($\varphi^1_{\lambda,\lambda}$ is denoted by $\varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda}$ in [DJM]). For $\lambda \in \varLambda^+_{n,r}$, a left $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$-module $W(\lambda)$ of $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ (so called Weyl module) is defined by

$$W(\lambda) = \big(\mathscr{S}_{n,r} \cdot \varphi^1_{\lambda,\lambda} + \mathscr{S}_{n,r}(> \lambda)\big)\big/\mathscr{S}_{n,r}(> \lambda).$$

Note that $W(\lambda)$ is an $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$-submodule of $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}(\ge \lambda)/\mathscr{S}_{n,r}(> \lambda)$. By [DR2, Theorem 5.15] (and its proof), for $S, T \in \mathcal{T}(\mu)$, we have

$$\varphi_{ST} = \varphi_{ST^\mu} \varphi^1_{\mu,\mu} \varphi_{T^\mu T}, \text{ where } \varphi_{ST^\mu} \in \mathscr{S}^{\le 0}_{n,r} \text{ and } \varphi_{T^\mu T} \in \mathscr{S}^{\ge 0}_{n,r}. \tag{7.13.1}$$

One sees from this that

$$W(\lambda) \cong \mathscr{S}^{\le 0} \cdot \varphi^1_{\lambda,\lambda}\big/\big(\mathscr{S}^{\le 0} \cdot \varphi^1_{\lambda,\lambda} \cap \mathscr{S}_{n,r}(> \lambda)\big) \text{ as } \mathcal{K}\text{-vector spaces.}$$

It is known that $\{W(\lambda) \,|\, \lambda \in \varLambda^+_{n,r}\}$ gives a complete set of isomorphism classes of (left) simple $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$-modules. Similarly, we have a complete set of isomorphism classes of (right) simple $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$-modules $\{W^\sharp(\lambda) \,|\, \lambda \in \varLambda^+_{n,r}\}$ such that

$$W^\sharp(\lambda) = \varphi^1_{\lambda,\lambda} \cdot \mathscr{S}^{\ge 0}\big/\big(\varphi^1_{\lambda,\lambda} \cdot \mathscr{S}^{\ge 0}_{n,r} \cap \mathscr{S}_{n,r}(> \lambda)\big) \text{ as } \mathcal{K}\text{-vector spaces.}$$

Recall that $\mathcal{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r}$) is an subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$ defined in 2.17. Then we have the following lemma.

Lemma 7.14. *The restriction of the surjection* Φ *(in Proposition 7.7) to* $\mathcal{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}$ *(resp.* $\mathcal{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r}$*) gives an isomorphism* $\Phi|_{\mathcal{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}} : \mathcal{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r} \to \mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}$ *(resp.* $\Phi|_{\mathcal{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r}} : \mathcal{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r} \to \mathscr{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r}$*) as algebras.*

Proof. By Proposition 6.7, the restriction of $\widetilde{\rho}$ (in Proposition 6.4) to $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^-$ gives a surjective homomorphism $\widetilde{\rho}|_{\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^-} : \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^- \to \mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}$. Since $\Phi \circ \Psi = \widetilde{\rho}$ (see Proposition 7.7) and $\Psi(\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}^-) = \mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}$, we have a surjective homomorphism $\Phi|_{\mathcal{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}} : \mathcal{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r} \to \mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}$.

On the other hand, thanks to Theorem 4.12, we can define the homomorphism $\Phi'^{\leq 0}$ of algebras from $\mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,1}$ to $U_{n,r}$ by sending the elements f_i $(1 \leq i \leq m-1)$ and $K_i^{\pm}$ $(1 \leq i \leq m)$ of $\mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,1}$ to the corresponding elements of $U_{n,r}$. Combining with isomorphisms $\mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,1} \cong \mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}$ and $U_{n,r} \cong \mathcal{S}_{n,r}$, $\Phi'^{\leq 0}$ induces a surjective homomorphism from $\mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}$ to $\mathcal{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}$. Thus, $\Phi|_{\mathcal{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}}$ is an isomorphism. The case of $\mathcal{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r}$ is similar. □

Lemma 7.15. *For* $\lambda \in \Lambda^+_{n,r}$*, the restriction of* Φ *to* $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}(\geq \lambda)$ *(resp.* $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}(> \lambda)$*) gives a surjective homomorphism of* $(\mathcal{S}_{n,r}, \mathcal{S}_{n,r})$*-bimodules* $\Phi|_{\mathcal{S}_{n,r}(\geq\lambda)} : \mathcal{S}_{n,r}(\geq \lambda) \to \mathscr{S}_{n,r}(\geq \lambda)$ *(resp.* $\Phi|_{\mathcal{S}_{n,r}(>\lambda)} : \mathcal{S}_{n,r}(> \lambda) \to \mathscr{S}_{n,r}(> \lambda)$*).*

Proof. Note that $\Phi(1_\mu) = \varphi^1_{\mu,\mu}$, and that $\varphi^1_{\mu,\mu} \in \mathscr{S}_{n,r}(\geq \lambda)$ if $\mu \geq \lambda$, we have $\Phi(\mathcal{S}_{n,r}(\geq \lambda)) \subset \mathscr{S}_{n,r}(\geq \lambda)$ since $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}(\geq \lambda)$ is a two-sided ideal of $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$.

On the other hand, one sees easily that

$$\mathcal{S}_{n,r}(\geq \lambda) = \sum_{\substack{\mu \in \Lambda^+_{n,r} \\ \mu \geq \lambda}} \mathcal{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r} 1_\mu \mathcal{S}^{\geq 0}_{n,r}.$$

Combining with (7.13.1) and Lemma 7.14, we have $\varphi_{ST} \in \Phi(\mathcal{S}_{n,r}(\geq \lambda))$ for any $S, T \in \mathcal{T}(\mu)$ ($\mu \in \Lambda^+_{n,r}$ such that $\mu \geq \lambda$). Thus, $\Phi|_{\mathcal{S}_{n,r}(\geq\lambda)}$ is a surjection from $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}(\geq \lambda)$ to $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}(\geq \lambda)$. The case of $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}(> \lambda)$ is similar. □

The following theorem is our main result in this paper.

Theorem 7.16.

(i) $\Phi : \mathcal{S}_{n,r} \to \mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ *gives an isomorphism of algebras. Moreover, by restricting* Φ *to* ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$*,* $\Phi|_{{}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_{n,r}}$ *gives an isomorphism from* ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$ *to* ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$*.*

(ii) $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ *is presented by generators* $E_{(i,k)}, F_{(i,k)}$ $\big((i,k) \in \Gamma'\big)$ *and* 1_λ $(\lambda \in \Lambda_{n,r})$ *with the defining relations* (7.4.1)-(7.4.8).

(iii) $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ *is also presented by generators* E_i, F_i $(1 \leq i \leq m-1)$ *and* $K_i^{\pm}$ $(1 \leq i \leq m)$ *with the defining relations* (1.5.1)-(1.5.3), (1.5.6), (1.5.7) *and* (7.11.1)-(7.11.3).

Proof. Through the surjection $\Phi : \mathcal{S}_{n,r} \to \mathscr{S}_{n,r}$, we can regard a simple $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$-module $W(\lambda)$ $(\lambda \in \Lambda^+_{n,r})$ as a simple $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$-module, and $\{W(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \Lambda^+_{n,r}\}$ gives a complete set of isomorphism classes of simple $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$-modules by Lemma 7.10. As $\widetilde{U}_q$-modules, both of $\Delta(\lambda)$ and $W(\lambda)$ are highest weight modules with a highest weight λ. Thus, by investigating the action on highest weight vectors of $\Delta(\lambda)$ and $W(\lambda)$, we have a surjective homomorphism

$$\Delta(\lambda) \to W(\lambda) \ \text{ as } \mathcal{S}_{n,r}\text{-modules.} \tag{7.16.1}$$

We claim the followings.

(claim): For any $\lambda \in \varLambda^+_{n,r}$, we have

$$\Delta(\lambda) \cong W(\lambda) \text{ as left } \mathcal{S}_{n,r}\text{-modules,} \qquad \Delta^\sharp(\lambda) \cong W^\sharp(\lambda) \text{ as right } \mathcal{S}_{n,r}\text{-modules,}$$
$$\Delta(\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{K}} \Delta^\sharp(\lambda) \cong \mathcal{S}_{n,r}(\geq \lambda)/\mathcal{S}_{n,r}(> \lambda) \text{ as } (\mathcal{S}_{n,r}, \mathcal{S}_{n,r})\text{-bimodules.}$$

If we assume the claim, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_{\mathcal{K}} \mathcal{S}_{n,r} &= \sum_{\lambda \in \varLambda^+_{n,r}} (\dim_{\mathcal{K}} \Delta(\lambda))^2 \\ &= \sum_{\lambda \in \varLambda^+_{n,r}} (\dim_{\mathcal{K}} W(\lambda))^2 \\ &= \dim_{\mathcal{K}} \mathscr{S}_{n,r}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that Φ gives an isomorphism from $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$ to $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$. Thus, it is enough to show the claim.

We recall that

$$\Delta(\lambda) \cong \mathcal{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r} \cdot 1_\lambda \big/ \big(\mathcal{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r} \cdot 1_\lambda \cap \mathcal{S}_{n,r}(> \lambda), \tag{7.16.2}$$
$$W(\lambda) \cong \mathscr{S}^{\leq 0} \cdot \varphi^1_{\lambda,\lambda} \big/ \big(\mathscr{S}^{\leq 0} \cdot \varphi^1_{\lambda,\lambda} \cap \mathscr{S}_{n,r}(> \lambda)\big) \tag{7.16.3}$$

as $\mathcal{K}$-vector spaces. Lemma 7.14 implies the following isomorphism ;

$$\Phi|_{\mathcal{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r} 1_\lambda} : \mathcal{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}\, 1_\lambda \cong \mathscr{S}^{\leq 0}_{n,r}\, \varphi^1_{\lambda,\lambda} \ \text{ as } \mathcal{K}\text{-vector spaces.} \tag{7.16.4}$$

We prove the claim by backword induction on the partial order of $\varLambda^+_{n,r}$.

First, we suppose that λ is maximal in $\varLambda^+_{n,r}$. In this case, we have $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}(> \lambda) = \{0\}$ and $\mathscr{S}_{n,r}(> \lambda) = \{0\}$. Thus, (7.16.1), (7.16.2), (7.16.3) and (7.16.4) implies that $\Delta(\lambda) \cong W(\lambda)$ as left $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$-modules. Similarly, we have $\Delta^\sharp(\lambda) \cong W^\sharp(\lambda)$ as right $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$-modules. Since $\Delta(\lambda)$ (resp. $\Delta^\sharp(\lambda)$) is a simple left (resp. right) $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$-module, the surjective homomorphism of $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$-bimodules $\Delta(\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{K}} \Delta^\sharp(\lambda) \to \mathcal{S}_{n,r}(\geq \lambda)/\mathcal{S}_{n,r}(> \lambda)$ is an isomorphism.

Next, we suppose that λ is not maximal in $\varLambda^+_{n,r}$. The induction hypothesis implies that the surjection $\Phi|_{\mathcal{S}_{n,r}(>\lambda)} : \mathcal{S}_{n,r}(> \lambda) \to \mathscr{S}_{n,r}(> \lambda)$ in Lemma 7.15 is an isomorphism by comparing dimensions. Combined with (7.16.1), (7.16.2), (7.16.3) and (7.16.4), this implies that $\Delta(\lambda) \cong W(\lambda)$ as left $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$-modules. Similarly, we have $\Delta^\sharp(\lambda) \cong W^\sharp(\lambda)$ as right $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$-modules. This implies that $\Delta(\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{K}} \Delta^\sharp(\lambda) \cong \mathcal{S}_{n,r}(\geq \lambda)/\mathcal{S}_{n,r}(> \lambda)$. Thus, we have the claim and (i) follows. The remaining assertions (ii) and (iii) follows from 7.4 and Proposition 7.12. □

Remarks 7.17.

(i) In the case where $r = 1$, generators and defining relations of $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$ (resp. $U_{n,r}$) in 7.4 (resp. 7.11) coincide with generators and defining relations of q-Schur algebras of type A in Theorem 4.10 (resp. Theorem 4.9) given by Doty and Giaquinto.

(ii) In a similar reason as in the case where $r = 1$ (see Remark 4.11), $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$ ($\cong \mathscr{S}_{n,r}$) satisfies the conditions (A-1), (A-2) and (C-1).

§ 8. An algorithm for computing decomposition numbers

In this section, we give an algorithm for computing the decomposition numbers of ${}_F\mathcal{S}_{n,r} \cong {}_F\mathscr{S}_{n,r}$ on an arbitrary field F and parameters $q, Q_1, \cdots, Q_r \in F$. Throughout this section, we consider the objects over a fixed field F, and so we will omit the subscript F (e.g. ${}_F\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$, ${}_F\Delta(\lambda), \cdots$) unless it causes some confusions.

8.1. Since $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$ satisfies the condition (C-1), we can define a bilinear form $\langle \, , \, \rangle_\iota : \Delta(\lambda) \times \Delta(\lambda) \to F$ by

$$\langle \overline{y1_\lambda}, \overline{x1_\lambda} \rangle_\iota 1_\lambda \equiv \iota(y1_\lambda)x1_\lambda \mod \mathcal{S}_{n,r}(> \lambda) \quad \text{for } x, y \in \mathcal{S}^-_{n,r}.$$

Note that $\langle \, , \, \rangle_\iota$ is symmetric. Put $\operatorname{rad}_\iota \Delta(\lambda) = \{\overline{x} \in \Delta(\lambda) \mid \langle \overline{y}, \overline{x} \rangle_\iota = 0 \text{ for any } \overline{y} \in \Delta(\lambda)\}$. One sees easily that $\langle \overline{y}, \overline{x} \rangle_\iota = \langle \overline{\iota(y)}, \overline{x} \rangle$ for $\overline{x}, \overline{y} \in \Delta(\lambda)$, thus we have $\operatorname{rad}_\iota \Delta(\lambda) = \operatorname{rad} \Delta(\lambda)$. Hence, from now on we denote $\langle \, , \, \rangle_\iota$ (resp. $\operatorname{rad}_\iota \Delta(\lambda)$) simply by $\langle \, , \, \rangle$ (resp. $\operatorname{rad} \Delta(\lambda)$).

8.2. For an $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$-module M, we have the weight space decomposition

$$M = \bigoplus_{\mu \in \Lambda_{n,r}} M_\mu,$$

where $M_\mu = 1_\mu \cdot M$. Since $\Delta(\lambda) = \mathcal{S}^-_{n,r} \cdot \overline{1_\lambda}$, we see that $\lambda \geq \mu$ if $\Delta(\lambda)_\mu \neq 0$. It is clear that $\Delta(\lambda)_\mu$ is spanned by

$$\Xi(\lambda - \mu) = \big\{ F^{(c_1)}_{(i_1,k_1)} F^{(c_2)}_{(i_2,k_2)} \cdots F^{(c_l)}_{(i_l,k_l)} \cdot \overline{1_\lambda} \bigm| c_1\alpha_{(i_1,k_1)} + c_2\alpha_{(i_2,k_2)} + \cdots + c_l\alpha_{(i_l,k_l)} = \lambda - \mu \big\}.$$

Note that $\Xi(\lambda - \mu)$ is a finite set. Then we can pick up a homogeneous basis of $\Delta(\lambda)_\mu$ from $\Xi(\lambda - \mu)$. We take a homogeneous basis $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)_\mu$ of $\Delta(\lambda)_\mu$, and fix it.

For $\lambda \in \Lambda^+_{n,r}$, $\mu \in \Lambda_{n,r}$, let

$$M(\lambda)_\mu = \Big(\langle \, \overline{b'}, \overline{b} \, \rangle \Big)_{\overline{b}, \overline{b'} \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)_\mu}$$

be a Gram matrix of the weight space $\Delta(\lambda)_\mu$. Put $\operatorname{rad} \Delta(\lambda)_\mu = \operatorname{rad} \Delta(\lambda) \cap \Delta(\lambda)_\mu$, then we have the following lemma.

Lemma 8.3. *We have*

$$\dim_F \operatorname{rad} \Delta(\lambda)_\mu = \operatorname{corank} M(\lambda)_\mu.$$

Proof. For $\overline{x} \in \Delta(\lambda)_\mu$, $\overline{y} \in \Delta(\lambda)_\nu$, we have $\langle \overline{y}, \overline{x} \rangle = 0$ unless $\mu = \nu$ by (2.13.3). Thus $\overline{x} \in \operatorname{rad}\Delta(\lambda)_\mu$ if and only if $\langle \overline{b'}, \overline{x} \rangle = 0$ for any $\overline{b'} \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)_\mu$. This implies the lemma. □

(Algorithm for computing decomposition numbers of $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$)

(step 1) Compute the value of $\langle \overline{b'}, \overline{b} \rangle$ for all $\overline{b}, \overline{b'} \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)_\mu$ ($\lambda \in \Lambda^+_{n,r}, \mu \in \Lambda_{n,r}$).

Note that by (2.13.1) and the definition of the bilinear form, we can compute $\langle \overline{b'}, \overline{b} \rangle$ by using the commutative relation (7.4.6) repeatedly.

(step 2) Compute the corank of $M(\lambda)_\mu$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda^+_{n,r}, \mu \in \Lambda_{n,r}$.

This is an elementally calculation of the linear algebra.

(step 3) Compute $\dim_F(L(\lambda)_\mu)$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda^+_{n,r}$, $\mu \in \Lambda_{n,r}$.

Since $L(\lambda) = \Delta(\lambda)/\operatorname{rad}\Delta(\lambda)$, we have

$$\dim_F(L(\lambda)_\mu) = \dim_F(\Delta(\lambda)_\mu) - \dim_F(\operatorname{rad}\Delta(\lambda)_\mu).$$

Thus, we can compute $\dim_F(L(\lambda)_\mu)$ by Lemma 8.3 and (step 2).

(step 4) Compute the decomposition numbers $d_{\lambda\mu} = [\Delta(\lambda) : L(\mu)]$ for $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+_{n,r}$ by the following inductive process.

By Theorem 3.6, we have $d_{\lambda\lambda} = 1$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda^+_{n,r}$. By induction, we may assume that $d_{\lambda\mu}$ is known for $\mu \in \Lambda^+_{n,r}$ such that $\lambda \geq \mu > \nu$, and we compute the decomposition number $d_{\lambda\nu}$.

Note the following four facts:

- $\operatorname{rad}\Delta(\lambda)$ is the unique maximal $\mathcal{S}_{n,r}$-submodule of $\Delta(\lambda)$,
- $d_{\lambda\mu} \neq 0$ $(\lambda \neq \mu)$ only if $\lambda > \mu$.
- $L(\mu)_\nu \neq 0$ only if $\mu \geq \nu$.
- $\dim_F L(\nu)_\nu = 1$.

These four facts imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_F(\operatorname{rad}\Delta(\lambda)_\nu) &= \sum_{\mu \in \Lambda^+_{n,r}\setminus\{\lambda\}} d_{\lambda\mu} \cdot (\dim_F L(\mu)_\nu) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\mu \in \Lambda^+_{n,r} \\ \lambda > \mu > \nu}} d_{\lambda\mu} \cdot (\dim_F L(\mu)_\nu) + d_{\lambda\nu}. \end{aligned} \tag{8.3.1}$$

By Lemma 8.3 and (step 2), we know $\dim_F(\operatorname{rad}\Delta(\lambda)_\nu)$. By the assumption of the induction together with (step 3), we know $\sum_{\substack{\mu \in \Lambda^+_{n,r} \\ \lambda > \mu > \nu}} d_{\lambda\mu} \cdot (\dim_F L(\mu)_\nu)$. Thus we can compute the decomposition number $d_{\lambda\nu}$ from the equation (8.3.1).

Remarks 8.4.

(i) In fact, in order to compute the decomposition numbers, it is enough to consider the Gram matrix $M(\lambda)_\mu$ only for $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+_{n,r}$ since we have

$$\dim_F L(\mu)_\nu = \dim_F \Delta(\mu)_\nu - \sum_{\tau \in \Lambda^+_{n,r}} d_{\mu\tau} \dim_F L(\tau)_\nu.$$

In this case, we should skip (step 3), and should add the following process of another induction on $\Lambda^+_{n,r}$ in (step 4) :

$$\begin{aligned} & d_{\mu\tau} \text{ is known for } \mu, \tau \in \Lambda^+_{n,r} \text{ such that } \lambda > \mu. \\ \Leftrightarrow\ & \dim_F L(\mu)_\nu \text{ is known for } \mu \in \Lambda^+_{n,r},\ \nu \in \Lambda_{n,r} \text{ such that } \lambda > \mu. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) Thanks to Theorem 3.4 and [DR2, Theorem 5.16 (f)] (or directly by comparing the highest weights as $\widetilde{U}_q$-modules), we have ${}_F\Delta(\lambda) \cong {}_FW(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda^+_{n,r}$. In particular, we have ${}_F\Delta(\lambda) = F \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}\Delta(\lambda)$ since it is known that ${}_FW(\lambda) = F \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}W(\lambda)$.

(iii) Our algorithm can be applied for an arbitrary field which is not necessarily of characteristic 0.

(iv) There exists a surjective homomorphism ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\widetilde{U}_q^- \to {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q^-$ as algebras, and we have ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\widetilde{U}_q^- \cong {}_{\mathcal{A}}U_q^-$. Thus, we have a surjective homomorphism of ${}_{\mathcal{A}}U_q^-$-modules:

$${}_{\mathcal{A}}U_q^- \to {}_{\mathcal{A}}\Delta(\lambda)\ (= {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{S}_q^- \cdot \overline{1_\lambda}) \text{ such that } 1 \mapsto \overline{1_\lambda}.$$

It maybe useful that we take a homogeneous basis of ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\Delta(\lambda)$ from the image of a certain homogeneous basis of ${}_{\mathcal{A}}U_q^-$ (e.g. monomial basis, PBW basis, canonical basis, $\cdots$).

(v) We can apply this algorithm to compute the decomposition numbers of ${}_F\mathcal{S}_q$ under the general setting in §3. Moreover, we can also apply to compute the decomposition numbers of ${}_F\mathcal{S}_q$ associated to any Cartan matrix of finite type, which includes the generalized q-Schur algebra constructed in [Do].

APPENDIX A. A PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4.7.

In this section, we give a proof of Proposition 4.7. The author thanks T. Shoji for communicating this fact.

A.1. Let V be a vector space over $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ with a basis $\{v_1, \cdots, v_m\}$. Then, $U_q = U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m)$ acts on V from left by

$$e_i \cdot v_j = \begin{cases} v_{j-1} & \text{if } j = i+1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$f_i \cdot v_j = \begin{cases} v_{j+1} & \text{if } j = i, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$K_i^{\pm} \cdot v_j = \begin{cases} q^{\pm 1} v_j & \text{if } j = i, \\ v_j & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This action is called a vector representation of U_q. We extend this action to a tensor space $V^{\otimes n}$ by using a comultiplication Δ of U_q defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(e_i) &= e_i \otimes K_i K_{i+1}^{-} + 1 \otimes e_i, \\ \Delta(f_i) &= f_i \otimes 1 + K_i^{-} K_{i+1} \otimes f_i, \\ \Delta(K_i^{\pm}) &= K_i^{\pm} \otimes K_i^{\pm}. \end{aligned}$$

We denote this action by $\rho' : U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m) \to \mathrm{End}(V^{\otimes n})$.

On the other hand, $\mathscr{H}_n$ acts on $V^{\otimes n}$ from right as follows. We define $\widetilde{T} \in \mathrm{End}(V \otimes V)^{\mathrm{op}}$ by

$$(v_i \otimes v_j) \cdot \widetilde{T} = \begin{cases} q\, v_i \otimes v_j & \text{if } i = j, \\ v_j \otimes v_i & \text{if } i < j, \\ v_j \otimes v_i + (q - q^{-1}) v_i \otimes v_j & \text{if } i > j, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathrm{End}(V \otimes V)^{\mathrm{op}}$ means an opposite algebra of $\mathrm{End}(V \otimes V)$. For $i = 1, \cdots, n-1$, we define $\widetilde{T}_i \in \mathrm{End}(V^{\otimes n})^{\mathrm{op}}$ by

$$\widetilde{T}_i = \mathrm{id}_V^{\otimes(i-1)} \otimes \widetilde{T} \otimes \mathrm{id}_V^{\otimes(n-1-i)}.$$

Then, we define an algebra homomorphism $\theta : \mathscr{H}_n \to \mathrm{End}(V^{\otimes n})^{\mathrm{op}}$ by $\theta(T_i) = \widetilde{T}_i$. By [J], it is known that the action of U_q and the action of $\mathscr{H}_n$ on $V^{\otimes n}$ commute. Moreover, we have

$$\rho'(U_q) = \mathrm{End}_{\mathscr{H}_n}(V^{\otimes n}).$$

A.2. For $\mu = (\mu_1, \cdots, \mu_m) \in \Lambda_{n,1}$, let $V_\mu^{\otimes n}$ be a subspace of $V^{\otimes n}$ spanned by $\{v_{i_1} \otimes v_{i_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{i_n} \mid \mu_j = \sharp\{k \mid i_k = j\} \text{ for } j = 1, \cdots, m\}$. One sees easily that $V_\mu^{\otimes n}$ is a weight space of $V^{\otimes n}$ with a weight μ as a U_q-module, and we have a weight space decomposition

$$V^{\otimes n} = \bigoplus_{\mu \in \Lambda_{n,1}} V_\mu^{\otimes n}.$$

Since the action of $\mathscr{H}_n$ commutes with the action of U_q, $V_\mu^{\otimes n}$ is invariant under the action of $\mathscr{H}_n$. For $\mu \in \Lambda_{n,1}$, put

$$v_\mu = \underbrace{v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_1}_{\mu_1 \text{ terms}} \otimes \underbrace{v_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_2}_{\mu_2 \text{ terms}} \otimes \cdots \otimes \underbrace{v_m \otimes \cdots \otimes v_m}_{\mu_m \text{ terms}}.$$

Then, we have $V_\mu^{\otimes n} = v_\mu \cdot \mathscr{H}_n$. Moreover, one can check that there exists an isomorphism $V_\mu^{\otimes n} \to M^\mu$ of $\mathscr{H}_n$-modules such that $v_\mu \mapsto x_\mu$. Thus, we have the following isomorphism of algebras.

$$\begin{aligned}\rho'(U_q) &= \mathrm{End}_{\mathscr{H}_n}(V^{\otimes n}) \\ &= \mathrm{End}_{\mathscr{H}_n}\Big(\bigoplus_{\mu\in\Lambda_{n,1}} V_\mu^{\otimes n}\Big) \\ &\cong \mathrm{End}_{\mathscr{H}_n}\Big(\bigoplus_{\mu\in\Lambda_{n,1}} M^\mu\Big).\end{aligned}$$

This isomorphism gives the surjection $\rho : U_q \to \mathscr{S}_{n,1}$ in Theorem 4.6.

A.3. For $\mu \in \Lambda_{n,1}$, put

$$\begin{aligned}A &= \underbrace{v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_1}_{\mu_1 \text{ terms}} \otimes \underbrace{v_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_2}_{\mu_2 \text{ terms}} \otimes \cdots \otimes \underbrace{v_i \otimes \cdots \otimes v_i}_{\mu_i \text{ terms}}, \\ B &= \underbrace{v_{i+2} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{i+2}}_{\mu_{i+2} \text{ terms}} \otimes \underbrace{v_{i+3} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{i+3}}_{\mu_{i+3} \text{ terms}} \otimes \cdots \otimes \underbrace{v_m \otimes \cdots \otimes v_m}_{\mu_m \text{ terms}}.\end{aligned}$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}v_\mu &= A \otimes \underbrace{v_{i+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{i+1}}_{\mu_{i+1} \text{ terms}} \otimes B, \\ v_{\mu+\alpha_i} &= A \otimes v_i \otimes \underbrace{v_{i+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{i+1}}_{\mu_{i+1}-1 \text{ terms}} \otimes B.\end{aligned}$$

By the definitions, one can compute that

$$\begin{aligned}\rho'(e_i)(v_\mu) &= \sum_{j=1}^{\mu_{i+1}} q^{-(\mu_{i+1}-j)} A \otimes \underbrace{v_{i+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{i+1}}_{j-1 \text{ terms}} \otimes v_i \otimes \underbrace{v_{i+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{i+1}}_{\mu_{i+1}-j \text{ terms}} \otimes B \\ &= q^{-\mu_{i+1}+1} \sum_{x \in X^{\mu}_{\mu+\alpha_i}} q^{\ell(x)} v_{(\mu+\alpha_i)} \cdot T_x.\end{aligned}$$

Under the isomorphism $V_\mu^{\otimes n} \cong M^\mu$, this implies that $\rho(e_i)(m_\mu) = q^{-\mu_{i+1}+1}\psi^1_{\mu+\alpha_i\,,\,\mu}(m_\mu)$. Thus, we have (i) in Proposition 4.7. For (ii), (iii) in Proposition 4.7, we can prove in a similar way.

APPENDIX B. EXAMPLE : CYCLOTOMIC q-SCHUR ALGEBRA OF TYPE $G(2,1,2)$

In this appendix, we consider a cyclotomic q-Schur algebra $\mathscr{S}_{2,2}$ of type $G(2,1,2)$, namely associated to the complex reflection group $\mathfrak{S}_2 \ltimes (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^2$. In this case, we will describe elements $\eta^\lambda_{(i,k)}$ explicitly, and compute the Gram matrices $M(\lambda)_\mu$ and decomposition numbers of ${}_{\mathbb{C}}\mathscr{S}_{2,2}$. Throughout this appendix, we replace γ_i with

Q_i $(i = 1, 2)$, thus $\mathscr{S}_{2,2}$ is an algebra over $\mathcal{K} = (q, Q_1, Q_2)$, where q, Q_1, Q_2 are indeterminate elements.

B.1. The cyclotomic q-Schur algebra $\mathscr{S}_{2,2}$ of type $G(2,1,2)$ is generated by the generators $E_{(1,1)}, E_{(2,1)}, E_{(1,2)}, F_{(1,1)}, F_{(2,1)}, F_{(1,2)}, 1_\lambda (\lambda \in \Lambda)$, where

$$\Lambda = \left\{ \begin{matrix} \lambda_{\langle 0 \rangle} = \big((2,0),(0,0)\big), & \lambda_{\langle 1 \rangle} = \big((1,1),(0,0)\big), & \lambda_{\langle 2 \rangle} = \big((1,0),(1,0)\big), \\ \lambda_{\langle 3 \rangle} = \big((1,0),(0,1)\big), & \lambda_{\langle 4 \rangle} = \big((0,2),(0,0)\big), & \lambda_{\langle 5 \rangle} = \big((0,1),(1,0)\big), \\ \lambda_{\langle 6 \rangle} = \big((0,1),(0,1)\big), & \lambda_{\langle 7 \rangle} = \big((0,0),(2,0)\big), & \lambda_{\langle 8 \rangle} = \big((0,0),(1,1)\big), \\ \lambda_{\langle 9 \rangle} = \big((0,0),(0,2)\big) & & \end{matrix} \right\},$$

with the defining relations (7.4.1) - (7.4.8). By Lemma 7.10, we have

$$\Lambda^+ = \{\lambda_{\langle 0 \rangle}, \lambda_{\langle 1 \rangle}, \lambda_{\langle 2 \rangle}, \lambda_{\langle 7 \rangle}, \lambda_{\langle 8 \rangle}\}.$$

By Lemma 7.2 and (7.3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} g^{\lambda_{\langle 1 \rangle}}_{(2,1)}(F,E) &= Q_1\big((q-q^{-1})F_{(1,1)}E_{(1,1)} + q^{-2}\big), \\ g^{\lambda_{\langle 4 \rangle}}_{(2,1)}(F,E) &= Q_1(q^2+1), \\ g^{\lambda_{\langle 5 \rangle}}_{(2,1)}(F,E) &= Q_1, \\ g^{\lambda_{\langle 6 \rangle}}_{(2,1)}(F,E) &= Q_1, \\ g^{\lambda_{\langle 2 \rangle}}_{(1,2)}(F,E) &= F_{(2,1)}E_{(2,1)} + Q_2, \\ g^{\lambda_{\langle 5 \rangle}}_{(1,2)}(F,E) &= F_{(1,1)}F_{(2,1)}E_{(2,1)}E_{(1,1)} + Q_2, \\ g^{\lambda_{\langle 7 \rangle}}_{(1,2)}(F,E) &= qF_{(2,1)}E_{(2,1)} + Q_2(1+q^2), \\ g^{\lambda_{\langle 8 \rangle}}_{(1,2)}(F,E) &= F_{(2,1)}E_{(2,1)} + Q_2, \end{aligned}$$

and $g^{\lambda}_{(2,1)}(F,E)$ (resp. $g^{\lambda}_{(1,2)}(F,E)$), which does not appear in the above list, is equal to 0.

As an example, we compute only $g^{\lambda_{\langle 1 \rangle}}_{(2,1)}(F,E)$. By the definitions, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^{\lambda_{\langle 1 \rangle}}_{(2,1)}(m_{\lambda_{\langle 1 \rangle}}) &= m_{\lambda_{\langle 1 \rangle}} L_2 \\ &= (L_1 - Q_2)(L_2 - Q_2)T_1 L_1 T_1 \\ &= T_1(L_1 - Q_2)L_1(L_2 - Q_2)T_1 \qquad (\because \text{ Lemma 5.4 (i), (iv)}) \\ &= Q_1 T_1 (L_1 - Q_2)(L_2 - Q_2)T_1 \\ &= Q_1(L_1 - Q_2)(L_2 - Q_2)\big((q-q^{-1})T_1 + 1\big) \qquad (\because T_1^2 = (q-q^{-1})T_1 + 1) \\ &= Q_1\big((q-q^{-1})m_{\lambda_{\langle 1 \rangle}} T_1 + m_{\lambda_{\langle 1 \rangle}}\big), \end{aligned}$$

where the fourth equality follows from $L_1 = T_0$ and $T_0^2 = (Q_1+Q_2)T_0 - Q_1Q_2$. On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi^-_{(1,1)}\varphi^+_{(1,1)}(m_{\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle}}) &= q^{-1}m_{\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle}}(1+qT_1)\\ &= m_{\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle}}T_1 + q^{-1}m_{\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle}}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have $\sigma^{\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle}}_{(2,1)} = Q_1\big((q-q^{-1})\varphi^-_{(1,1)}\varphi^+_{(1,1)} + q^{-2}\big)\varphi^1_{\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle},\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle}}$. This implies that

$$g^{\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle}}_{(2,1)}(F,E) = Q_1\big((q-q^{-1})F_{(1,1)}E_{(1,1)} + q^{-2}\big).$$

Since $\eta^{\lambda}_{(2,1)} = \Big(-Q_2[\lambda^{(1)}_2 - \lambda^{(2)}_1] + q^{\lambda^{(1)}_2-\lambda^{(2)}_1}\big(q^{-1}g^{\lambda}_{(2,1)}(F,E) - qg^{\lambda}_{(1,2)}(F,E)\big)\Big)1_{\lambda}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta^{\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle}}_{(2,1)} &= \Big(Q_1(q-q^{-1})F_{(1,1)}E_{(1,1)} + (Q_1q^{-2} - Q_2)\Big)1_{\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle}},\\
\eta^{\lambda_{\langle 2\rangle}}_{(2,1)} &= -F_{(2,1)}E_{(2,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 2\rangle}},\\
\eta^{\lambda_{\langle 4\rangle}}_{(2,1)} &= \Big(Q_1(q^3+q) - Q_2(q+q^{-1})\Big)1_{\lambda_{\langle 4\rangle}},\\
\eta^{\lambda_{\langle 5\rangle}}_{(2,1)} &= \Big(-qF_{(1,1)}F_{(2,1)}E_{(2,1)}E_{(1,1)} + (Q_1q^{-1} - Q_2q)\Big)1_{\lambda_{\langle 5\rangle}},\\
\eta^{\lambda_{\langle 6\rangle}}_{(2,1)} &= (Q_1 - Q_2)1_{\lambda_{\langle 6\rangle}},\\
\eta^{\lambda_{\langle 7\rangle}}_{(2,1)} &= -F_{(2,1)}E_{(2,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 7\rangle}},\\
\eta^{\lambda_{\langle 8\rangle}}_{(2,1)} &= -F_{(2,1)}E_{(2,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 8\rangle}},\\
\eta^{\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle}}_{(2,1)} &= \eta^{\lambda_{\langle 3\rangle}}_{(2,1)} = \eta^{\lambda_{\langle 9\rangle}}_{(2,1)} = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

B.2. We can take a homogeneous basis of ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\Delta(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$ as followings.

basis of ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\Delta(\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle})$	
weight	basis
$\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle}$	$\overline{1_{\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle}}}$
$\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle}$	$\overline{F_{(1,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle}}}$
$\lambda_{\langle 2\rangle}$	$\overline{F_{(2,1)}F_{(1,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle}}}$
$\lambda_{\langle 3\rangle}$	$\overline{F_{(1,2)}F_{(2,1)}F_{(1,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle}}}$
$\lambda_{\langle 4\rangle}$	$\overline{F^{(2)}_{(1,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle}}}$
$\lambda_{\langle 5\rangle}$	$\overline{F_{(2,1)}F^{(2)}_{(1,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle}}}$
$\lambda_{\langle 6\rangle}$	$\overline{F_{(1,2)}F_{(2,1)}F^{(2)}_{(1,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle}}}$
$\lambda_{\langle 7\rangle}$	$\overline{F^{(2)}_{(2,1)}F^{(2)}_{(1,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle}}}$
$\lambda_{\langle 8\rangle}$	$\overline{F_{(1,2)}F^{(2)}_{(2,1)}F^{(2)}_{(1,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle}}}$
$\lambda_{\langle 9\rangle}$	$\overline{F^{(2)}_{(1,2)}F^{(2)}_{(2,1)}F^{(2)}_{(1,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle}}}$

basis of ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\Delta(\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle})$	
weight	basis
$\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle}$	$\overline{1_{\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle}}}$
$\lambda_{\langle 2\rangle}$	$\overline{F_{(2,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle}}}$
$\lambda_{\langle 3\rangle}$	$\overline{F_{(1,2)}F_{(2,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle}}}$
$\lambda_{\langle 5\rangle}$	$\overline{F_{(1,1)}F_{(2,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle}}}$
$\lambda_{\langle 6\rangle}$	$\overline{F_{(1,2)}F_{(1,1)}F_{(2,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle}}}$
$\lambda_{\langle 8\rangle}$	$\overline{F_{(2,1)}F_{(1,2)}F_{(1,1)}F_{(2,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle}}}$

basis of ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\Delta(\lambda_{\langle 2\rangle})$	
weight	basis
$\lambda_{\langle 2\rangle}$	$\overline{1_{\lambda_{\langle 2\rangle}}}$
$\lambda_{\langle 3\rangle}$	$\overline{F_{(1,2)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 2\rangle}}}$
$\lambda_{\langle 5\rangle}$	$\overline{F_{(1,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 2\rangle}}}$
$\lambda_{\langle 6\rangle}$	$\overline{F_{(1,2)}F_{(1,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 2\rangle}}}$
$\lambda_{\langle 7\rangle}$	$\overline{F_{(2,1)}F_{(1,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 2\rangle}}}$
$\lambda_{\langle 8\rangle}$	$\overline{F_{(2,1)}F_{(1,2)}F_{(1,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 2\rangle}}}$, $\overline{F_{(1,2)}F_{(2,1)}F_{(1,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 2\rangle}}}$
$\lambda_{\langle 9\rangle}$	$\overline{F_{(1,2)}F_{(2,1)}F_{(1,2)}F_{(1,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 2\rangle}}}$

basis of ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\Delta(\lambda_{\langle 7\rangle})$	
weight	basis
$\lambda_{\langle 7\rangle}$	$\overline{1_{\lambda_{\langle 7\rangle}}}$
$\lambda_{\langle 8\rangle}$	$\overline{F_{(1,2)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 7\rangle}}}$,
$\lambda_{\langle 9\rangle}$	$\overline{F^{(2)}_{(1,2)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 7\rangle}}}$

basis of ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\Delta(\lambda_{\langle 8\rangle})$	
weight	basis
$\lambda_{\langle 8\rangle}$	$\overline{1_{\lambda_{\langle 8\rangle}}}$

B.3. We can compute the Gram matrix of ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\Delta(\lambda)_\mu$ $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+$ with respect to the above basis. Here, as an example, we compute $M(\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle})_{\lambda_{\langle 2\rangle}}$. Note that ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\Delta(\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle})_{\langle 2\rangle}$ has a basis $\{\overline{F_{(2,1)}F_{(1,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle}}}\}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&1_{\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle}}E_{(1,1)}E_{(2,1)}F_{(2,1)}F_{(1,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle}}\\
&= E_{(1,1)}\Big(Q_1(q-q^{-1})F_{(1,1)}E_{(1,1)} + (Q_1q^{-2}-Q_2)\Big)F_{(1,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle}}\\
&= \Big(Q_1(q-q^{-1})[2][2] + (Q_1q^{-2}-Q_2)[2]\Big)1_{\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle}} \qquad (\because E_{(1,1)}F_{(1,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle}} = [2]1_{\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle}})\\
&= [2](Q_1q^2-Q_2)1_{\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle}}.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\big\langle \overline{F_{(2,1)}F_{(1,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle}}}, \overline{F_{(2,1)}F_{(1,1)}1_{\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle}}}\big\rangle = [2](Q_1q^2-Q_2)$. Thus, we have $M(\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle})_{\lambda_{\langle 2\rangle}} = \Big([2](Q_1q^2-Q_2)\Big)$.

In a similar way, we can compute the Gram matrix $M(\lambda)_\mu$ for $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+_{n,r}$, and we have

$\Delta(\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle})$;

$$\begin{aligned}
M(\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle})_{\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle}} &= \Big([2]\Big)\\
M(\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle})_{\lambda_{\langle 2\rangle}} &= \Big([2](q^2Q_1-Q_2)\Big)\\
M(\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle})_{\lambda_{\langle 7\rangle}} &= \Big((Q_1-Q_2)(q^2Q_1-Q_2)\Big)\\
M(\lambda_{\langle 0\rangle})_{\lambda_{\langle 8\rangle}} &= \Big([2](Q_1-Q_2)(q^2Q_1-Q_2)\Big)
\end{aligned}$$

$\Delta(\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle})$;

$$\begin{aligned}
M(\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle})_{\lambda_{\langle 2\rangle}} &= \Big((q^{-2}Q_1-Q_2)\Big)\\
M(\lambda_{\langle 1\rangle})_{\lambda_{\langle 8\rangle}} &= \Big((Q_1-Q_2)(q^{-2}Q_1-Q_2)\Big)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\Delta(\lambda_{\langle 2\rangle})\ ; \qquad M(\lambda_{\langle 2\rangle})_{\lambda_{\langle 7\rangle}} = \Big(q(q^{-2}Q_1 - Q_2)\Big)$$

$$M(\lambda_{\langle 2\rangle})_{\lambda_{\langle 8\rangle}} = \begin{pmatrix} (Q_1 - Q_2) & q(q^{-2}Q_1 - Q_2) \\ q(q^{-2}Q_1 - Q_2) & [2]q(q^{-2}Q_1 - Q_2) \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\Big(\det M(\lambda_{\langle 2\rangle})_{\lambda_{\langle 8\rangle}} = (q^{-2}Q_1 - Q_2)(q^2Q_1 - Q_2)\Big)$$

$$\Delta(\lambda_{\langle 7\rangle})\ ; \qquad M(\lambda_{\langle 7\rangle})_{\lambda_{\langle 8\rangle}} = \Big([2]\Big)$$

B.4. Let $\mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{C}$ be a ring homomorphism, and we express the image of q, Q_1, Q_2 in $\mathbb{C}$ by the same symbol. We can compute the decomposition numbers of ${}_{\mathbb{C}}\mathscr{S}_{2,2} = \mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathscr{S}_{2,2}$ by using the algorithm in §8, and we have the following decomposition matrix of ${}_{\mathbb{C}}\mathscr{S}_{2,2}$.

$(q^2 \neq \pm 1, 0,\ \ Q_1 = Q_2 \neq 0)$

$\Delta(\lambda)\backslash L(\mu)$	λ_8	λ_7	λ_2	λ_1	λ_0
λ_8	1				
λ_7	0	1			
λ_2	0	0	1		
λ_1	1	0	0	1	
λ_0	0	1	0	0	1

$(q^2 \neq \pm 1, 0,\ \ q^{-2}Q_1 = Q_2 \neq 0)$

$\Delta(\lambda)\backslash L(\mu)$	λ_8	λ_7	λ_2	λ_1	λ_0
λ_8	1				
λ_7	0	1			
λ_2	0	1	1		
λ_1	0	0	1	1	
λ_0	0	0	0	0	1

$(q^2 \neq \pm 1, 0,\ \ q^2Q_1 = Q_2 \neq 0)$

$\Delta(\lambda)\backslash L(\mu)$	λ_8	λ_7	λ_2	λ_1	λ_0
λ_8	1				
λ_7	0	1			
λ_2	1	0	1		
λ_1	0	0	0	1	
λ_0	0	0	1	0	1

$(q^2 = -1,\ \ \pm Q_1 \neq Q_2)$

$\Delta(\lambda)\backslash L(\mu)$	λ_8	λ_7	λ_2	λ_1	λ_0
λ_8	1				
λ_7	1	1			
λ_2	0	0	1		
λ_1	0	0	0	1	
λ_0	0	0	0	1	1

$(q^2 = -1,\ \ Q_1 = Q_2 \neq 0)$

$\Delta(\lambda)\backslash L(\mu)$	λ_8	λ_7	λ_2	λ_1	λ_0
λ_8	1				
λ_7	1	1			
λ_2	0	0	1		
λ_1	1	0	0	1	
λ_0	1	1	0	1	1

$(q^2 = -1,\ \ -Q_1 = Q_2 \neq 0)$

$\Delta(\lambda)\backslash L(\mu)$	λ_8	λ_7	λ_2	λ_1	λ_0
λ_8	1				
λ_7	1	1			
λ_2	0	1	1		
λ_1	0	0	1	1	
λ_0	0	1	1	1	1

$(q^2 = 1,\ \ Q_1 = Q_2 = 0)$

$\Delta(\lambda)\backslash L(\mu)$	λ_8	λ_7	λ_2	λ_1	λ_0
λ_8	1				
λ_7	0	1			
λ_2	1	1	1		
λ_1	1	0	1	1	
λ_0	0	1	1	0	1

$(q^2 \neq -1, 0,\ \ Q_1 = Q_2 = 0)$

$\Delta(\lambda)\backslash L(\mu)$	λ_8	λ_7	λ_2	λ_1	λ_0
λ_8	1				
λ_7	0	1			
λ_2	1	1	1		
λ_1	1	0	1	1	
λ_0	0	1	1	0	1

$(q^2 = -1,\ \ Q_1 = Q_2 = 0)$

$\Delta(\lambda)\backslash L(\mu)$	λ_8	λ_7	λ_2	λ_1	λ_0
λ_8	1				
λ_7	1	1			
λ_2	2	1	1		
λ_1	1	0	1	1	
λ_0	1	1	1	1	1

APPENDIX C. EXAMPLE : THE CASE OF $\eta_i^\lambda = 0$

In this appendix, we give an extreme example of $\mathcal{S}_q$ which is not a cyclotomic q-Schur algebra.

C.1. We take $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{Q}(q)$. Put $\Lambda = \{\lambda = (\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m \,|\, \lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_m = n\}$, and $\eta_i^\lambda = 0$ for any $i = 1, \cdots, m-1$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Then, $\mathcal{S}_q = \mathcal{S}_q^{\eta_\Lambda}$ is the algebra generated by E_i, F_i $(1 \leq i \leq m-1)$ and 1_λ $(\lambda \in \Lambda)$ with the defining relations (2.1.1)-(2.1.6), (2.1.8), (2.1.9) together with the relation

$$E_iF_j - F_jE_i = 0. \tag{2.1.7'}$$

In this case, one sees easily that $\Lambda = \Lambda^+$. We denote a monomial of F_i (resp. E_i) for $i = 1, \cdots, m-1$ by $X(F)$ (resp. $Y(E)$). Then, one sees that

$$X(F)1_\lambda \notin \mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda), \qquad \big(\text{resp. } 1_\lambda Y(E) \notin \mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda)\big)$$

if $\lambda + \deg(X(F)) \in \Lambda$ (resp. $\lambda - \deg(Y(E)) \in \Lambda$). On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} X(F)\,1_\lambda\, Y(E) &= X(F)Y(E)1_{\lambda - \deg(Y(E))} \\ &= Y(E)X(F)1_{\lambda - \deg(Y(E))} \\ &= Y(E)1_{\lambda - \deg(Y(E)) + \deg(X(F))}X(F). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have $X(F)\,1_\lambda\,Y(E) = 0$ if $\lambda - \deg(Y(E)) + \deg(X(F)) \notin \Lambda$. It happens that $\lambda + \deg(X(F)) \in \Lambda$, $\lambda - \deg(Y(E)) \in \Lambda$ and $\lambda - \deg(Y(E)) + \deg(X(F)) \notin \Lambda$. This shows that the natural surjection $\Delta(\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{K}} \Delta^\sharp(\lambda) \to \mathcal{S}_q(\geq \lambda)/\mathcal{S}_q(> \lambda)$ is not an isomorphism in general. (Note that (C-2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (C'-2).)

For $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+ (= \Lambda)$, one sees that

$$M(\lambda)_\mu = 0 \quad \text{ unless } \lambda = \mu,$$

where 0 means the zero-matrix. This implies that $\dim_{\mathcal{K}} L(\lambda)_\mu = 0$ unless $\lambda = \mu$, and that

$$[\Delta(\lambda) : L(\mu)] = \dim_{\mathcal{K}} \Delta(\lambda)_\mu.$$

REFERENCES

[AK] S. Ariki and K. Koike, A Hecke algebra of $(\mathbb{Z}/r\mathbb{Z}) \wr \mathfrak{S}_n$ and construction of its irreducible representations, *Adv. Math.* **106** (1994), 216-243.

[DDPW] B. Deng, J. Du, B. Parshall and J. Wang, *Finite Dimensional Algebras and Quantum Groups*, *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs* Vol.**150**, Amer. Math. Soc. 2008.

[DJM] R. Dipper, G. James, and A. Mathas, Cyclotomic q-Schur algebras, *Math. Z.* **229** (1998), 385-416.

[Do] S. Doty, Presenting generalized q-Schur algebras, *Representation theory* **7** (2003), 196-213.

[Du] J. Du, A note on quantized Weyl reciprocity at root of unity, *Algebra Colloq.* **2** (1995), 363-372.

[DG] S. Doty and A. Giaquinto, Presenting Schur Algebras, *International Mathematical Research Notices* **36** (2002) 1907-1944.

[DP] J. Du and B. Parshall, Monomial bases for q-Schur algebras, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **355** (2003), 1593-1620.

[DR1] J. Du and H. Rui, Based algebras and standard bases for quasi-hereditary algebras, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **350** (1998), 3207-3235.

[DR2] J. Du and H. Rui, Borel type subalgebras of the q-Schur^m algebra, *J. Algebra* **213** (1999), 567-595.

[GL] J. J. Graham and G. I. Lehrer, Cellular algebras, *Invent. Math.* **123** (1996), 1-34.

[J] M. Jimbo, A q-analogue of $U(\mathfrak{gl}(N+1))$, Hecke algebra and the Yang-Baxter equation, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **11** (1986), 247-252.

[KX] S. König and C.C. Xi, On the structure of cellular algebras, *Canadian Math. Soc. Conference Proceedings.* **24** (1998), 365-386.

[M] A. Mathas, *Iwahori-Hecke algebras and Schur algebras of the symmetric group*, *University Lecture Series* Vol.**15**, Amer. Math. Soc. 1999.

[PW] B. Parshall and J.-P. Wang, *Quantum linear groups*, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* vol.**89**, No. 439, (1991).

[SakS] M. Sakamoto and T. Shoji, Schur-Weyl reciprocity for Ariki-Koike algebras, *J. Algebra* **221** (1999), 293-314.

[Saw] N. Sawada. On decomposition numbers of the cyclotomic q-Schur algebras, *J. Algebra* **311** (2007), 147–177.

[SawS] N. Sawada and T. Shoji, Modified Ariki-Koike algebras and cyclotomic q-Schur algebras, *Math. Z.* **249** (2005), 829-867.

[S1] T. Shoji A Frobenius formula for the characters of Ariki-Koike algebras, *J. Algebra* **226** (2000), 818-856.

[S2] T. Shoji, private communication.

[SW] T. Shoji and K. Wada, Cyclotomic q-Schur algebras associated to the Ariki-Koike algebra, preprint, arXiv:0707.1733.

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS NAGOYA UNIVERSITY, FUROCHO, CHIKUSAKU, NAGOYA, JAPAN 464-8602

E-mail address: `kentaro-wada@math.nagoya-u.ac.jp`